Studies in English

Volume 13 Article 14

1972

Vol. 13 (1972): Full issue

Journal Editors

Studies in English

The University of Mississippi Department of English

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

Volume Thirteen

University, Mississippi

1972

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

The University of Mississippi Studies in English is published annually by the Department of English of the University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi. The subscription price for each volume is two dollars.

JAMES EDWIN SAVAGE

(1903–1972)

Professor of English

Contents

Inverted Religious Imagery in Hopkins' 'Carrion Comfort'

by Christina J. Murphy

"Carrion Comfort," the first of Gerard Manley Hopkins' "terrible sonnets," generally has been analyzed as the culminating expression of Hopkins' ideational use of language. Such analyses as Ann Louise Hentz' "Language in Hopkins' 'Carrion Comfort' "[1] make Hopkins' view of the metaphorical complexities of language the central concern of the poem but fail to observe that the thematic and emotional intensity of the sonnet is dependent upon an underlying, inverted use of images drawn from Christian theology. While the significance of Hopkins' theory of language cannot be denied as a shaping factor of the sonnet, neither can the relevance of the unusual religious imagery of "Carrion Comfort" to Hopkins' theological views be minimized. The nature of Hopkins' God, long assumed to be the traditional Christian God of love and mercy, cannot be understood independent of the unconventional religious imagery of "Carrion Comfort."

The sonnet begins:

> Not, I'll not, carrion comfort, Despair, not feast on thee;[2]

The line focuses upon death and despair. The comfort described as "carrion" calls up associations of Christ and the sacrament of Holy Communion. There, too, the feast is upon a "carrion comfort," leading to greater joy and love of God. This association is strengthened by the reference in lines 9–10 to the chaff and the grain—grains of wheat being, of course, the essential element of the Eucharistic host or wafer. But in this "Gethesemane of the mind"[3] depicted in the poem, the theological order is inverted. Not Christ but Despair as a type of God-figure provides "carrion comfort." The word "feast" in

1 *Victorian Poetry*, 9 (1971), 197–202.

2 All citations of Hopkins' poetry are from *Gerard Manley Hopkins: Poems and Prose*, ed. W.H. Gardner (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1968).

3 Patricia A. Wolfe, "The Paradox of Self: A Study of Hopkins' Spiritual Conflict in the 'Terrible' Sonnets," *Victorian Poetry*, 6 (1968), 85.

this context takes on a self-indulgent quality. The experience of Despair is one which is despised, but one which is also enjoyed, to some extent, as a form of emotional release.

The next three lines of the poem:

> Not untwist—slack they may be—these last strands of man
> In me or, most weary, cry *I can no more.* I can;
> Can something, hope, wish day come, not choose not to be.

emphasize that feasting upon Despair is a self-destructive gesture, untwisting the last strands of man in Hopkins. This image can have two meanings. The first recalls "carrion" of line one and emphasizes that Hopkins, in despairing, is separating himself from God and is undergoing a kind of spiritual or psychic death. The second would make "these last strands of man in me" his last efforts of will. "Most weary," thus, would emphasize that Hopkins has been fighting the enervating battle of will against Despair and now finds himself ready to cry, *"I can no more."*

The poem seems strongly to suggest the second interpretation. The conflict is one of the self and of the self's will. Romano Guardini would have the "sheer plod" in the last section of "The Windhover" equal motions directed by effort and will.[4] Perhaps the despair in the opening lines of "Carrion Comfort" is so intense precisely because "sheer plod" is missing. Hopkins no longer has the will to align himself and his being with God. He remains isolated and apart from Him, crying *"I can no more."* But such a stark realization brings forth a new type of determination which states that Hopkins "can do something." He can "hope," hope to be delivered from this dark night of the soul into the brilliance of the day. He can "hope" and he can "not choose not to be." Introduced in this line is the paradox of the self. In a letter to Coventry Patmore, Hopkins stated, "I cannot follow you in your passion for paradox: more than a little of it tortures."[5] There is "more than a little" paradox in the line "not choose not to be." As Patricia A. Wolfe states in "The Paradox of Self: A Study of Hopkins' Spiritual Conflict in the 'Terrible' Sonnets":

[4] "Aesthetic-Theological Thoughts on 'The Windhover,'" in *Hopkins: A Collection of Critical Essays,* ed. Geoffrey H. Hartman (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1966), p. 78.

[5] *Further Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins,* ed. Claude Colleer Abbott, (London, 1956), p. 388.

The surrender of man's mortal selfhood can be considered either a glorious transition from a lower to a higher state or a torturous sacrifice of human identity in order to achieve union with God's eternal spirit. Man's reaction to it is based entirely on his own personal willingness to relinquish his limited potency in favor of the omnipotence of God. At best it is a struggle which divine grace alleviates through the gift of implicit faith. At worst, it is an introspective agony in the garden when man, keenly aware of his gradual loss of human individuality, kneels at the edge of a spiritual cliff and looking downward into the vast chasm, utters weakly: "Abba, Father, all things *are* possible to thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt" (Mark *xiv.* 36).[6]

The spiritual conflict Hopkins depicts in "Carrion Comfort" has larger paradoxical implications than those which Miss Wolfe delineates. Inherent in the image of feasting upon "carrion comfort" is the idea that feeding upon death leads ultimately and only to spiritual and psychic death. Self-annihilation is the final end of feasting upon the "carrion comfort" of Despair. The other alternative, the one Miss Wolfe emphasizes, leads to either a greater awareness of the self through God or, as Miss Wolfe writes, "a torturous sacrifice of human identity," which is in itself a form of self-obliteration. Placed in the boundary situation of confronting the void, Hopkins rejects the self-defeating course of Despair and places implicit faith in God that "the surrender of man's mortal selfhood"[7] will lead to greater glory. This turning from Despair to hoped-for release and awareness is engendered, in part, by the degree and intensity of Hopkins' Despair-suffering:

> But ah, but O thou terrible, why wouldst thou rude on me
> Thy wring-world right foot rock? lay a lionlimb against me? scan
> With darksome devouring eyes my bruised bones? and fan,
> O in turns of tempest, me heaped there; me frantic to avoid thee and flee?

Peter L. McNamara in "Motivation and Meaning in the 'Terrible Sonnets' " states that the "opponent" referred to in these lines as "terrible" (in the sense of being able to inspire terror) and as viewing the poet with "darksome devouring eyes" is God.[8] In McNamara's

[6] Wolfe, pp. 89–90.

[7] Wolfe, p. 89.

[8] "Motivation and Meaning in the 'Terrible Sonnets,' " *Renascence*, 16 (1963), 80.

reading, "Carrion Comfort" takes on a theodicial quality in which the whole focus and intensity of the poem centers upon the "Why?" voiced in line nine:

> Having passed through his struggle with doubt and confusion, Hopkins is given the joyful illumination of recognizing that in "That night, that year / Of now done darkness I wretch lay wrestling with (my God!) my God." The immensity of his discovery makes Hopkins catch his breath with the thrill of the honor done him (signified by the parenthetical "my God!").[9]

No textual support exists for McNamara's reading, but for such a reading support may be found in the concern that Hopkins' poetry "reflect an attitude in keeping with his religious vocation,"[10] the very concern that McNamara attacks and disdains but nevertheless employs. "O thou terrible" may refer just as easily to Despair as it can, in McNamara's reading, to God. Following the rather basic but still necessary rule of associating the meaning of a pronoun with the noun to which it refers, "O thou terrible" can refer only to Despair. No direct reference to God is made in the poem until the last line. Thus, in such a reading as I propose, it would be Despair which rudes upon Hopkins the "wring-world right foot rock," that scans "with darksome devouring eyes" Hopkins' "bruised bones," and that fans "O in turns of tempest, me heaped there; me frantic to avoid thee / and flee." "Why?" thus would answer the question of why Hopkins is so frantic "to avoid thee / and flee." The answer: "That my chaff might fly; my grain lie, sheer and clear." Avoiding, fleeing Despair, Hopkins can rid himself of the chaff of human weaknesses and limitations and can allow his "grain," his spiritual essence, to lie "sheer and clear."

Realizing through the weakened state Despair has engendered in him man's dependence upon God for spiritual fulfillment, Hopkins then turns the focus of his attention upon the strength to be derived from a love and an awareness of God. Obedience ("I kissed the rod") is stressed as an essential factor of "my heart lo! lapped strength, stole joy, would laugh, / cheer." But a major conflict is emphasized in "cheer whom though?" Should the poet praise God "whose heaven-handling flung me, / foot trod"—the God who creates man and allows man to suffer in His name; or should the poet praise "me that fought

[9] McNamara, pp. 80, 94.
[10] McNamara, p. 78.

him?"—the individual self, the will of man, which withstood the test and fought against the "heaven-handling" "foot trod" of Despair? The parenthetical "my God!" need not be, as McNamara states, "the thrill of the honor done him" in "having passed through his struggle with doubt and confusion,"[11] but may well be Hopkins' startling and perhaps even terrifying realization that he was fighting not only against himself in attempting to overcome Despair but also with his God.

This recognition has been foreshadowed, almost foreordained, from the first line of the poem, in which Despair, described as an inverted Christ-figure of "carrion comfort," took on the characteristics of being an emissary or representative of God. The emotional intensity of the parenthetical "my God!" thus becomes symbolic not of Hopkins' awareness and acceptance of God's will, but of his devastating realization that man's relationship to God is determined not by comfort and compassion but by conflict.

[11] McNamara, pp. 84, 90.

Noah Webster's Influence on American English

by Charles Dale Cannon

The three-fold concern of this study is Noah Webster's influence on spelling reform, his influence on lexicography, and his influence on the language deriving from patriotism. Though Webster had about him a dogged pertinacity and a quality of temperament that lent itself well to controversy, causing him once to be styled the "critick and coxcomb general of the United States,"[1] his phenomenal success and popularity are attested by the fact that his name has become synonymous with English dictionaries in the United States. He receives homage in such uncritical expressions as "As *the* dictionary says," "According to Webster," and the honorific "As Mr. Webster says." Along with Eversharp, Kodak, Frigidaire, Kleenex, and other trade names that now function as synecdoche, Noah Webster's name has been received as an alternate term for any product similar in function to that of Noah Webster's.

Though Webster's name is now more likely first associated with his dictionary, his first contribution to American English was not his dictionary. Schooled at Yale to be a lawyer, Webster found himself teaching school and while teaching perceived the inadequacy of the texts then available for instructing his pupils in English grammar and usage. Nothing daunted by the fact that his training may not have matched his enthusiasm for the task, he prepared a work which was a speller, a grammar, and a reader under what Baugh calls the "high-sounding title,"[2] *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language*. Though Webster is probably responsible for naming another of his works *Dissertations on the English Language*, he is not responsible for the pompous title of the earlier work. H. C. Commager says that President Ezra Stiles of Yale "dictated" the title *Grammatical*

[1] Mitford M. Mathews, *A Survey of English Dictionaries* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), p. 45

[2] Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), p. 425.

Institute of the English Language, Webster having intended *The American Instructor* as the title.[3]

Nor was other support from his alma mater lacking. At a later stage in Webster's career, Dr. Goodrich, trustee of Yale, encouraged Webster to continue his linguistic interests.[4] Since this advice came after the publication of the *Blue Backed Speller,* which sold approximately eighty million copies within a hundred years,[5] it is unlikely that the advice, though undoubtedly appreciated, was responsible for Webster's continuing.

In 1789 he published *Dissertations on the English Language with Notes Historical and Critical,* and in 1806 he published a *Dictionary* which was to be, as Baugh writes, "preliminary to *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828), his greatest work."[6]

The depth and breadth of Noah Webster's learning receive somewhat divergent assessments at the hands of different scholars. Harry Warfel says that Webster in order "to buttress his arguments [for some of his unpopular views on language] scanned every available writing on language. And thus the schoolmaster became the scholar, the first thorough student of the English language in America."[7]

In Thomas Pyles' hands, however, Webster gets a treatment similar to that received by Milton at the hands of Dr. Johnson. Pyles comments on Webster's recommendations on usage. Though Webster was hardly deferential to contemporary usage in determining his recommendations about language matters, he approved such expressions as "It is me," "Who is she married to," and "them horses." Webster backed up his approval of "them horses" with the German "*in dem Himmel,*" which he said meant "in them heavens," German being "our parent language."[8] Pyles remarks sharply on Webster's ignorance of German.

Webster's influence on spelling reform, the first major division of this study, derives as much from his dictionary as from his other

[3] Henry Steele Commager, "Noah Webster," *Saturday Review,* XLI (October 18, 1958), 10.

[4] Mathews, *Dictionaries,* p. 37.

[5] Baugh, p. 425.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Harry R. Warfel, ed., *Noah Webster's Dissertations on the English Language* (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimilies & Reprints, 1951), p. iv.

[8] Thomas Pyles, *Words and Ways of American English* (New York: Random House, 1952), p. 99.

works. In terms of chronology, however, the speller precedes the dictionary. A chronological rather than a logical basis accounts for my treating Webster's influence on spelling reform before treating his influence on lexicography, because the publication of his dictionary both continued and reinforced the influence on spelling reform begun by the speller.

The number of spelling reformers since Orm and his *Ormulum* has been legion. During almost any year, most newspaper editors will write at least one editorial favoring spelling reform, and many will propose their own new systems for spelling. Benjamin Franklin, George Bernard Shaw, and Theodore Roosevelt have been interested in spelling reform. Some of the systems proposed would require more effort to learn and to apply than mastering the International Phonetic Alphabet. William Watt cites Dr. Godfrey Dewey's "simplified spelling" for the opening lines of the "Gettysburg Address": "Forskor and sevn yeerz agoe our faadherz braut forth on dhis kontinent a nue naeshun konseeved in liberti, and dedikaeted to the propezeshun dhat aul men ar kreated eekwal."[9]

Compared with the average proponent of spelling reform over the years, Webster has had a rather good record. Mathews says that Webster did not know that spelling ranks right along with religion as something people are sensitive about changing.[10] Nevertheless, according to Mathews, Webster's efforts at reform compared with those of predecessors and contemporaries are "very sound and commendable."[11]

According to Kemp Malone, Webster's success in spelling reform is attested by the fact that we have "*civilize*, not *civilise*; *honor*, not *honour*" and the principle that "verbs ending in a short vowel plus a single consonant when stressed on the last syllable, double the consonant in certain inflexional forms and derivatives, but when stressed on any other syllable do not so double the consonant . . . . In England the consonant is doubled whatever the stress."[12] Mathews lists the

9 William Watt, *An American Rhetoric* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 541.

10 Mitford M. Mathews, *The Beginnings of American English* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 45.

11 Mathews, *Dictionaries*, p. 43.

12 Kemp Malone, "A Linguistic Patriot," *American Speech*, I (1925), 29.

following spellings which met with Webster's approval: "*ake, crum, fether, honor, iland, ile* (for *aisle*), *theater,* and *wether.*"[13]

It is a delicate matter to correct people's spelling or pronunciation, and Webster was, according to Warfel, aware of the fact that in telling people how to "correct their pronunciation" he was inviting abuse. Webster said some people will "sooner dismiss their friends than their prejudices." In one of his "Dissertations"on the English language, Webster said that his position as one correcting is "delicate and embarrassing," for "to attack established customs is always hazardous."[14]

Pyles cites the "petition for a copyright" for one of Webster's works which stated the following purpose: "To reform the abuses and corruptions which, to an unhappy degree tincture the conversation of the polite part of the Americans . . . and . . . to render the pronunciation accurate and uniform . . . ."[15]

The publication of Webster's Dictionary not only exerted a continuing influence on spelling reform and pronunciation, but it also had a significant influence on lexicography. A consideration of Webster's influence on lexicography is the next concern of this study. Webster's competence as a lexicographer has been the subject of dispute, and the judgments of him diverge rather sharply. Webster is at times praised but at others condemned.

Warfel says, for example, that in the preparation of his dictionary Webster "became a profound student of linguistics, and he developed interesting theories of the relationship of languages." Admitting that some of Webster's ideas were untenable, Warfel points out that Webster himself later discarded many of these ideas and that "more of Webster's conclusions remain tenable today than any scholar has taken pains to report."[16]

Mencken scores Webster for his "blunder of deriving all languages from the Hebrew of the Ark" but credits him with perceiving the "relationship between Greek, Latin, and the Teutonic languages before it was generally recognized." Furthermore, though he could not

[13] Mathews, *Dictionaries,* p. 43.
[14] Warfel, ed., *Dissertations,* pp. 146–147.
[15] Pyles, p. 96.
[16] Warfel, p. 146.

"pass as a philologian now," he was "extremely well read for his time."[17]

Pyles comments on Webster's delinquency in deriving all languages from Chaldee (Biblical Aramaic) which Webster called "the parent of all languages." Pyles represents Webster as running around his special "semicircular desk," consulting books in various languages for fleeting moments, and acquiring what knowledge he had of the twenty-three languages of which he was the self-taught master. Webster "set out to prepare a synopsis of the twenty-three languages, not to mention 'the early dialects of the English and German,' which he is supposed to have learned."[18] Pyles adds that Webster's knowledge of Old English was inferior to that of Thomas Jefferson, though Jefferson considered himself an amateur, Pyles indicating that Webster's knowledge of Old English was similar to that one would expect from "a beginning graduate student."[19]

If Webster was delinquent in his etymologies—and Pyles, no uncritical admirer of Webster, says that "subsequent editors have without comment excised by the basketful Webster's etymological 'boners' "[20] —he is nevertheless accorded praise by Sir James Murray, who calls Webster a "born definer of words."[21] Moreover, though Mathews often finds Webster's etymologies to be deficient, he nonetheless finds "far more of Webster's etymologies were correct than those of any lexicographer who had preceded him. He made many mistakes, but he got many things right."[22]

Webster was attacked for the vocabulary of his dictionary. Since his word stock was larger than that of previous dictionaries, Mathews says that the "five thousand additional words were branded as Americanisms or vulgarisms"[23] by those who considered Webster presumptuous in increasing the number. It is as dangerous to alter the mythical total stock of words in the language as it is to trifle with sacrosanct spellings and pronunciations. Mathews says that people are upset to

17 H. L. Mencken, *The American Language* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1936), p.9.
18 Pyles, pp. 113–114.
19 *Ibid.*, pp. 116–117.
20 *Ibid.*
21 *Ibid.*
22 Mathews, *Dictionaries*, p.42.
23 Mathews, *Beginnings*, p.47.

learn that words they are using "are not in the dictionary" and are equally distraught to learn that someone has presumptuously added words to "the dictionary." When Webster "claimed to have added five thousand words 'to the number found in the best English compends,' " he was not courting popularity.[24]

To be attacked for "vulgarisms" in his dictionary must have been especially galling for Webster (and he responded with speed and heat), for he had said he wished to rid English in America of "vulgarisms which were necessarily settlers from various parts of Europe."[25] In letters to Thomas Dawes[26] and John Pickering[27] Webster defended the vocabulary of his dictionary and invited comparison of the vocabulary of his dictionary with that of Johnson's. Webster said that he had excluded from his dictionary many "cant words" found in Johnson's dictionary.[28] Webster seems to equivocate about what words should be included in the vocabulary of a dictionary. At one time he said "The business of the lexicographer is to collect, arrange and define, as much as possible, *all* the words that belong to a language...." At another time he said that "in general, vulgar words are the oldest and best authorized words in the language; and their use is as necessary to the classes of people who use them as elegant words are to the statesman and the poet."[29]

In the heat of controversy, however, Webster while defending himself could attack Dr. Johnson's dictionary for "including more of the lowest of all vulgar than any other now extant, Ash excepted." The testimony of Webster's granddaughter, who once lived with him, is that the only time she ever saw him roused to anger was at a time when "a dubious and rather indelicate word was mentioned before him."[30] Webster protested once in defending his vocabulary that no dictionary in English in existence "is so free from *local, vulgar,* and *obscene words* as mine!"[31]

Had he been able to accomplish his aim, Read says that Webster would have published a bowdlerized "edition of noted English po-

24 *Ibid.*
25 Commager, p.12.
26 Mathews, *Beginnings,* p.50.
27 Gilbert M. Tucker, *American English* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1921), p.53.
28 Mathews, *Beginnings,* p.50.
29 Allen W. Read, "An Obscenity Symbol," *American Speech,* IX (1934), 274.
30 *Ibid.,* pp. 273–274.
31 Mathews, *Beginnings,* p. 50.

ems."[32] He did publish in 1833 what Pyles characterizes as a "corrected, sterilized and bowdlerized version of the King James Bible" in which he had corrected the grammar and excised the vulgarity.[33] There were many expressions in the Bible which could not, according to Webster, "be uttered, especially in promiscuous company, without violence to decency."[34]

Whatever the misgivings some of his critics have had about Webster's dictionary, which Kemp Malone said might have well been called *A Patriotic Dictionary of the American Language,*[35] Webster was not apologetic as he set it forth:

> It satisfies my mind that I have done all that my health, my talents, and my pecuniary means would enable me to accomplish. I present it to my fellow citizens not with frigid indifference but with my ardent wishes for their improvement and their happiness: and for the continued increase of the wealth, the moral and relgious elevation of character and the glory of my country.[36]

Among the critics of Webster's ability as a lexicographer and the value of Webster's work, Harold Whitehall must be classified with the dissenters, though he, as well as Pyles, sometimes discerns merit in Webster's work. Though the citation of Whitehall's remarks is to an essay in *Essays on Language and Usage,* it is worth remembering that this essay first appears in the Introduction to *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language,* a work which competes with the Merriam-Webster's *Collegiate* Dictionaries, putative lineal descendants of Noah Webster's earlier works.

Though granting that 1828 is an important date in American lexicography because of the appearance of Webster's dictionary, Whitehall says that because of the "two-volume format and its relatively high price it never achieved any real degree of popular acceptance in Webster's own lifetime." Whitehall commends the quality of the definitions of this dictionary as "probably its greatest contribution," for they were "of a clarity and pithiness never approached before its day." Though it was the first "*native* dictionary comparable in scope

32 Read, p. 273.
33 Pyles, p. 122.
34 Read, p. 273.
35 Malone, p. 29.
36 "Noah Webster," *Word Study,* XXXIV (October, 1958), 1.

to that of Dr. Johnson," it was not, in Whitehall's opinion, "as is often claimed, the real parent of the modern American dictionary; it was merely the foster-parent."[37]

Whitehall comments on the rivalry of Webster's dictionary and that of Joseph Worcester and points out that George P. Krapp finds Worcester's *Comprehensive Pronouncing and Explanatory Dictionary of the English Language* (1830) superior to the competing product of Webster. There followed a hot war of dictionaries which had rival publishers using "deplorable tactics" while "trying to put the other out of business." The result of this was, on the positive side, an increase in quality of the competing dictionaries.[38]

If Worcester's work in 1830 was better than Webster's of 1828, Whitehall says that the 1847 Webster, edited by Webster's son-in-law, Chauncey A. Goodrich, was better than the current Worcester work. Published by the Merriams, it was "the first Webster dictionary to embody the typical American dictionary pattern." The 1864 Webster also outstripped the 1860 Worcester, and Whitehall finds three factors helping to account for the predominance of Webster's product over that of Worcester:

(1) Webster's *Little Blue Back Speller*
(2) the death of Joseph Worcester
(3) the merit of the Merriam product from 1864.[39]

When Kemp Malone said that Webster's dictionary "might not inappropriately have [been] called *A Patriotic Dictionary of the American Language*,"[40] he notes an aspect of Noah Webster's patriotism and its influence on American English. Malone says at a time when patriotism was a "religion," Webster was "the most whole-souled and thorough-going patriot of that day . . . ."[41]

Baugh says that following the Declaration of Independence and the conclusion of the Revolutionary War many people in America were very much concerned with the development of an American civilization, being, as a result of their patriotism, less inclined to accept the "cultural supremacy" of England. What the new world had

37 Harold Whitehall, "The Development of the English Dictionaries," *Essays on Language and Usage* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 10–11.
38 *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.
39 *Ibid.*
40 Malone, p. 29.
41 *Ibid.*, p. 26.

achieved in the political realm was supposed an earnest of what might be accomplished for civilization as a whole in America. Webster subscribed wholeheartedly to this hope and justified his dictionary by "stressing American usage and American pronunciation, adopting a number of distinctive spellings, and especially by introducing quotations from American authors."[42]

Though Webster was a reluctant convert to spelling reform and once denounced alterations as "absurdities" and the result of a "rage for singularities," once he was convinced, he had the zeal of a convert. His recantation of earlier views was attributed to the fact that his former opinion "was hasty, being the result of a slight examination of the subject. I now believe with Dr. Franklin that such a reformation is practicable and highly necessary."[43] Webster even went so far in his advocacy of spelling reform that he listed as one of its advantages the fact that the dissimilarity of spelling would eventually compel the publication of books both in America as well as in England.[44]

Fervent patriotism could have its liabilities for a linguist and a literary critic. Cady, in a comment on Webster's "Defence of American Letters," remarks Webster's "militancy" and "pedantry," and speaks of his "almost desperate effort to keep a balance between a national defense of America and the temptation to praise the native writer only because he is native."[45]

Such patriotism might well have led to a national Academy. In fact John Adams, later President Adams, addressed a letter on September 5, 1780, to the President of Congress in which he proposed "the 'erecting of an American Academy for refining, improving and ascertaining the English language.' "[46] Though Webster was a member of the Philological Society of New York, an organization that Allen Read styled "an outcropping of linguistic patriotism,"[47] he was not in favor of an American Academy. Pyles says that the reason Webster was not in favor of an academy, as had been proposed in the Congress of 1806, was not the fact that, like Thomas Jefferson, he

42 Baugh, pp. 425–429.

43 *Ibid.*, pp. 429–430.

44 Malone, p. 27.

45 Edwin H. Cady, ed., *Literature of the Early Republic* (New York: Rinehart, 1960), p. 467.

46 Mathews, *Dictionaries*, pp. 36–37.

47 Allen W Read, "The Philological Society of New York, 1788," *American Speech*, IX (1934), 131.

was opposed to it in principle, but that he was working on his dictionary, "which he believed would furnish a much more authoritative standard than the pronouncements of any academy."[48]

The linguist in Webster could at times override the patriot, for Webster changed some of his attitudes about the essential unlikeness of American and British English. In his *Dissertations* of 1789, he had pointed up the differences between the language in the two countries. Though the patriotic element was far from absent in his dictionary, Pyles says that by 1828 Webster had come to believe it was " 'desirable to perpetuate that sameness' rather than to point up the differences as he had done in his *Dissertations* of 1789. Actually he had come to think that there were not many local terms in use in this country."[49]

One of the continuing influences of Webster involves the vocabulary. There are probably many grandfathers who would become righteously indignant at anyone who used indelicate language in the presence of their granddaughters, but not many of the grandfathers have bowdlerized a Bible for their granddaughters, much less published one. Webster's solicitude for his and other granddaughters carried over into the vocabulary of his dictionary, and even a cursory comparison of the Merriam-Webster dictionaries preceding the advent of the *Third International* with comparable Oxford dictionaries will reveal a different tradition.

Another influence has been the matter of authority. By its wide dissemination and great popular approval, Webster's phenomenally successful *Speller* achieved a quasi-official sanction that the Merriams have been inheritors of in continuing Noah Webster's work. Furthermore the patriotic element should not be minimized, especially at the time when Webster's was the only native dictionary. Though it did not long retain this distinction, it was the first, and Noah Webster's personality was such that he did not react passively to competition.

Webster's severest critics concede, even praise, the quality of his definitions, and it seems as anachronistic to judge Webster's methods and knowledge by present-day standards in linguistics as it would be to question the greatness of Galileo because he could not adequately

[48] Pyles, pp. 87–88.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

fill the chair of physics at, say, the University of Chicago or join the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton.

Finally, the influence of Webster continues in the Merriam-Webster dictionaries. Though the *Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary* no longer includes Webster's picture as the earlier dictionaries in this series did, the influence of Noah Webster persists beyond the name alone. Part of the excellence of the Webster dictionaries proceeded from competition. Noah Webster did not hesitate to enter the lists in the defense of his work. Anyone who has lent a sympathetic ear to representatives of the publishers of Webster's modern rivals can well believe that the spirit of Noah must yet inform the Merriam organization as it strives not only to equal but also to outstrip its competitors.

No one conversant with the conflicting and sometimes bombastic advertising of competing dictionaries today can approve all the statements made in behalf of the competing dictionaries. Indeed, some of the claims of advertising are contradicted in the introductory pages of the dictionaries making the claims, especially those relating to "authority," but it is likely that despite the derogation and half-truths used in the controversy, the result of the conflict will be better dictionaries. One may confidently predict that the successors to Noah Webster will do their best to set forth the merits of their product.

Sir Orfeo: The Self and the Nature of Art

by Christina J. Murphy

Considerations of *Sir Orfeo* generally have focused more upon praise than analysis.[1] The few serious criticisms of *Sir Orfeo* available are limited by their *a priori* classification of the poem as a romance.[2] *Sir Orfeo* is not strictly nor solely a romance but a work which has developed within several traditions,[3] the most important and pervasive of which in the poem is the Orpheus myth. The alterations of the myth made by the poet provide, perhaps, the best way of analyzing the poem's meaning, significance, and effect.

The author of *Sir Orfeo* made at least four significant changes in the myth of Orpheus. Orfeo emerges not as a divine being born of Kalliope and Apollo but as a king. Such a change may be, of course, a direct result of the social structure of Europe in the fourteenth century and of the expectations of audiences of that century's popular romances. But, even with these objections in mind, it still could be asserted that the poet might have written of Orpheus as a divine being and have made his poem an allegory of man's fate in the world. The fact that Orfeo is a king adds two important features to the de-

[1] J. Burke Severs in "The Antecedents of *Sir Orfeo*," in *Studies in Medieval Literature in Honor of Professor Albert Croll Baugh*, ed. MacEdward Leach (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961), p. 187, calls the poem "one of the loveliest and most charming of all Middle English romances"; L. A. Hibbard Loomis, *Medieval Romance in England* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1961), p. 195, describes the work as "inimitably fresh in style and content"; W.L. Renwick and H. Orton, *The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton* (London: Cresset Press, 1952), p. 381, characterize *Sir Orfeo* as a "charming tale of minstrelsy and true love"; David Daiches, *A Critical History of English Literature* (New York: Ronald Press, 1970), I, 66, describes the work as "fresh and charming"; and Margaret Schlauch asserts in *English Medieval Literature and Its Social Foundations* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956), p. 191, that the poem is "a gem of its kind."

[2] See particularly A. J. Bliss, "Introduction" to *Sir Orfeo* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966); and George Kane, *Middle English Literature* (London: Methuen, 1951).

[3] For a complete discussion of the traditions within which *Sir Orfeo* developed see Constance Davies, "Classical Threads in *Orfeo*," *Modern Language Review*, 56 (1966), 159–65.

sign of the poem. First, it makes Orfeo a powerful representative of his society and yet also a representative man. His story is at once both individual and universal. This device, of course, adds much to the dramatic intensity of the poem. But, even more significantly, the device enables the poet to show by contrast with art the limitations of society in dealing with the irrationalities of the faery world.

The diminution if not total elimination of the quest motif of the Orpheus legend is the second change made by the poet of *Sir Orfeo*. Kenneth R.R. Gros Louis in his excellent article "The Significance of Sir Orfeo's Self-Exile" attacks A.J. Bliss' statement that the second edition of the poem "tells of Orfeo's long search for Herodis, and of his eventual success."[4] Gros Louis claims that this is not the focus of the second edition and that, in fact, "there is no search in the entire poem nor does Orfeo ever plan to make one. If we do not recognize this crucial fact, we fail not only to see the uniqueness of *Sir Orfeo* in the tradition of the Orpheus myth, but also to understand the intention of its author."[5]

Orfeo's recovery of Herodis marks the third change of the legend in the poem. Orfeo does not lose Herodis a second time as Orpheus lost Eurydice by looking back at her at the mouth of Hell in disobedience of the conditions laid down for her return to earth. Orfeo's journey in pursuit of Herodis is a complete success. The fourth change made by the poet is a concomitant factor of Orfeo's triumph. At the end of his journey, Orfeo returns to rule his kingdom in harmony and peace. Orpheus' journey ends with his death—he is torn to pieces by the Maenads, his head floating down the river still singing and finally coming to rest on the island of Lesbos.

The fundamental aspects of the Orpheus myth the poet of *Sir Orfeo* preserved. The view of Orpheus is that which prevailed into the Renaissance, derived, as it was in medieval times, from the same major source—the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. Orpheus was regarded as a poet-prophet, "a harmonizing and civilizing influence who caused order to prevail through his power over universal nature."[6] Moreover, "mythographers interpreted the legend of his death as an alle-

[4] Bliss, p. *xlii*.

[5] "The Significance of Sir Orfeo's Self-Exile," *The Review of English Studies*, 18 (1967), 245–46.

[6] Caroline W. Mayerson, "The Orpheus Image in *Lycidas*," *PMLA*, 64 (1949), 189.

gory of human wisdom and art, which are periodically destroyed by barbarism but which reappear in succeeding cycles of culture."[7]

The fact that Orfeo does not die in the poem should not be a bar to this type of interpretation. Orfeo's journey to the underworld can be viewed as a symbolic death, imitating as it does Christ's death and resurrection and thus reflecting the influence of Christian theology upon the work. A standard reading of *Sir Orfeo* is to view it as a Christian allegory in which Orfeo as a Christ-like figure contends with the Faery King of the underworld who is thought to be in such a reading an apt analogue for Satan. Kenneth R.R. Gros Louis has pointed out that Orfeo is very much unlike the aggressive classical Orpheus.[8] Orfeo remains passive and restrained at the moment of his earthly trial and does not challenge the authority of the gods. The Renaissance view, like the medieval, metaphorically identified Orpheus with Christ primarily because of their similar attributes—their humility, gentleness, and "power to subdue and reconcile hostile and mutually antagonistic forces."[9] This aspect of the Orpheus myth *Sir Orfeo* celebrates. The emphasis is upon harmony and reconcilliation rather than upon the tragic pose of defiance. Culture and art survive the threats of barbarism and irrationality in *Sir Orfeo,* but not at the cost of the hero's life. The focus is decidedly Christian. The importance of the individual man is stressed, and the Christian virtues of humility, loyalty, faith, and devotion are rewarded.

The poem makes a fundamental statement not only about the nature of virtue and man's state in the world, but also about the nature of art. The "power to subdue and reconcile hostile and mutually antagonistic forces" metaphorically attributed to Orpheus and to Christ in the work is also the primary value that the *Sir Orfeo*-poet finds inherent in art. The Orpheus myth serves as an apt symbol for art itself, for, as Gustaf Freden states in *Orpheus and the Goddess of Nature,* Orpheus' song can "create harmony out of the dissonance of the universe; it brings the whole of the cosmos into harmony."[10] If one accepts James F. Knapp's hypothesis that "the conflict in *Sir Orfeo* may be described in terms of a mythic hero attempting to deliver his

7 Mayerson, pp. 189–90.
8 Gros Louis, p. 249.
9 Mayerson, p. 193.
10 *Orpheus and the Goddess of Nature* (Goteborg: n.p., 1958), p. 19.

world from the powers of darkness,"[11] the question naturally arises as to how man can deliver himself from darkness in this Boethian picture of the universe. Boethius found his answer in Philosophy. The *Sir Orfeo*-poet emphasizes virtue and individual integrity and places his faith in the power of art to deliver man from the chaos of darkness and the irrationalities of life.

The poem begins with a description of Sir Orfeo, a king in England and a great nobleman. He is "a stalworth man," as bold as he is liberal and courtly. "Orpheo most of anything / Lovede the gle of harpying":

> Syker was every gode harpoure
> Of hym to have moche honoure.
> Hymself loved for to harpe,
> And layde theron his wittes scharpe.
> He lernid so, ther nothing was
> A better harper in no plas.[12]
> (11–16)

The first sixteen lines of the poem present and emphasize the two primary motifs of individual virtue and art.

Depicted in the next section of the poem is Orfeo's love for his queen, Herodis. When Orfeo hears of the queen's grief and hysteria after her return from the orchard, "Never him nas werse fer no thing." He rushes to her chamber with ten knights, and, beholding his queen's distraught look and hysterical grief, speaks to her "with grete pitie." The queen's story that "now we mot delen a-two" draws from Orfeo a response of loyalty and love:

> Whider thou gost, ich wil with thee,
> And whider I go, thou schalt with me.
> (105–106)

When the queen tells him of the threat from the Faery King, Orfeo's response is one of personal grief:

11 "The Meaning of *Sir Orfeo*," *Modern Language Quarterly*, 29 (1968), 269.

12 *Sir Orfeo*, in *The Age of Chaucer*, Vol. I of *The Pelican Guide to English Literature*, ed. Boris Ford (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966), pp. 269–85. All references are to this text.

"O wel!" quath he, "allas, allas!
Lever me were to lete mi lif
Than thus to lese the Quen mi wif!"
(152–54)

But Orfeo must subjugate his personal response to his role in and relationship to society. He asks counsel of each man as to how he can save the queen from the powers and evil of the underworld, but no man can answer him. Orfeo phrases his decision in terms of his relationship to his society. As the head and representative of his society, he takes "wele ten hundred knightes with him / Ech y-armed stout and grim" to protect the queen. But his effort fails, and Herodis is abducted by the Faery King.

The implications of Orfeo's actions from the time he is told of Herodis' fate until she is taken from him into the underworld are extremely significant. Orfeo reveals that he possesses a great knowledge and understanding of interpersonal relationships. He is a man who knows himself and who knows the queen's love for him. He has, too, a great understanding of societal relationships. He is praised as a great king and a noble man. He asks advice of each of his men, demonstrating his wisdom in dealing with his subjects and his lack of self-centered and self-defeating pride.

But Orfeo's attempt to save his queen through a display of force and the power of ten hundred knights represents both a type of pride and a type of ignorance on his part. He is both proud and ignorant in thinking that he can circumvent the forces of destiny and fate. Queen Herodis, as miserable and unhappy as Orfeo about her misfortunes, makes no attempt to overcome her fate. Instead, she submits to the dictates of the gods, and her obedience may be one of the reasons why she is allowed to return to the upper-world with Orfeo. Orfeo's refusal to submit to the dictates of the gods represents on his part an ignorance of the workings of the cosmos. As knowledgeable as he is of interpersonal and societal relationships, he knows little of the workings of Nature and of the universe.

Orfeo, in many ways, resembles Shakespeare's King Lear. Both Orfeo and Lear undergo great personal suffering and change in fortunes, moving from a king to a pilgrim, from a leader of society to an exile from society; but both come also to a greater awareness and

realization of themselves in terms of their relation to the cosmos. Thus, we can see, as Gros Louis has asserted,[13] the significance of the fact that Orfeo's is a self-imposed exile rather than a quest deliberately undertaken in pursuit of Herodis. Orfeo calls in his "barouns, erls," and "lordes of renouns" and announces to them:

> "Lordinges," he said, "bifor you here
> Ich ordainy min heighe steward
> To wite my kingdom afterward:
> In my stede ben he shal,
> To kepe my londes over al.
> For, now ic-have mi Quen y-lore,
> The fairest levedi that ever was bore,
> Never eft I nil no woman se.
> Into wildernes ich wil te,
> And live their evermore
> With wilde bestes in holtes hore.
> And when ye understood that I be spent,
> Make you than a parlement
> And chese you a newe king.
> Now doth your best with al my thing."
> (180–94)

When Orfeo returns from the world of the Faery King and asks of the beggar who has taken him into his home, "who the kingdom held in hond," the beggar relates the story of Herodis' abduction by the faeries and tells of "how her king an exile yede." Orfeo's statement, "Into wildernes ich wil te / And live ther evermore" marks a significant alteration in the Orpheus myth by the *Sir Orfeo*-poet. The traditional emphasis in the myth had been upon the quest motif and the pursuit of the love object. But here the focus has changed, and the emphasis is upon the self rather than the love object. The self's relationship to the universe rather than to another human being is integral to the type of rebirth or spiritual awakening achieved by both Orfeo and Lear.

Entering upon his self-imposed exile, Orfeo takes with him only a pilgrim's mantle and his harp. These two objects are interesting symbols of the experience which Orfeo must undergo to reconcile himself to the laws of the cosmos, for the pilgrim's mantle represents an

[13] Gros Louis, p. 245.

individual, highly personal search for the true expression of the self and the harp represents a more universal form of self-expression. Orfeo's problem in the poem is to reconcile the particular with the universal, to reconcile the individual with the cosmos. Symbolized by Orfeo's harp, art thus becomes a metaphor for both the problem and its solution, for in art the particular expression of the individual self is merged with the more general, the more universal expression which is the domain of art. The balance achieved between the particular and the general in art symbolizes the reconciliation to cosmological laws which Orfeo seeks. The poet of *Sir Orfeo* has achieved a complex point of view in which his poem as a work of art comments not only upon the nature of the human condition, but also upon the very nature of art itself.

The progressions of Herodis and Orfeo in the poem reflect significantly upon the work's design and meaning. Herodis moves from the world of society to a world which is better described as "anatural" than as "supernatural." To this anatural world Herodis travels as a passive victim, moving from one realm or state of consciousness to another without any deliberate effort or attempt on her part. Orfeo, in contrast, moves from the world of society to the natural world and then to the anatural world. Whereas Orfeo influenced the laws of society through personal virtue, he excercises control over the laws of the natural world through art. During his ten-year exile into the "holtes hore":

> He toke his harp to him wel right,
> And harped at his owhen wille.
> Into alle the wode the soun gan shille
> That alle the wilde bestes that ther be-th
> For joye abouten him thai teth;
> And alle the foules that ther were
> Come and sete on ech a brere
> To here his harping a-fine
> So miche melody was therin.
> And when he his harping lete wold,
> No best by him abide nold.
> (246–56)

Such a view is in keeping with the traditional aspects of the Orpheus myth in which Orpheus through his harping could exercise control

over both animate and inanimate nature. In *Sir Orfeo,* Orfeo's powers are extended to the anatural world. In the world of the Faery King, Orfeo's harping exerts control and orders experience.

In Herodis' experience, magic mediated between the world of society and the anatural world; in Orfeo's experience, art exists as a constant in the world of society, the natural world, and the anatural world and is capable of mediating amongst the three. D.M. Hill has attempted to impose a Freudian reading upon *Sir Orfeo,* arguing of the passage in which Orfeo sees "the king o'fairy with his rout / com to hunt him al about" that:

> The passage describes how, during Orfeo's solitary and no doubt for the most part silent sojourn in the wilderness, he would be on occasion afflicted by the sudden bursting about him of the other world hunt. The passage constitutes a representation of the threat of madness: an objectifying of a mental state.[14]

No proof exists in the poem for such a reading. The hunt is described as a literal event perceived by Orfeo as an actuality. If, like Hill, one wishes to make a case for the *Sir Orfeo*-poet's great understanding of subconscious motivations and of the human mind, a better case could be made for the poet in terms of his understanding of the workings of the mind in the creation of art. What the poet here has objectified is the psychical triad of the superego, the ego, and the id which Freud attributed to the mind. Art serves to the *Sir Orfeo*-poet as it does to Freud as a mediator amongst these three worlds or realms of consciousness—the superego, represented in the poem by society and its dictates; the ego, represented by the natural world and its laws; and the id, symbolized by the Faery King's anatural world of the irrational. The fact that the Faery King's abductions of innocent women were often considered to be motivated by lust[15] lends further credence to this association of the Faery King's anatural world with the id, considered by Freud to be the seat of man's passions and natural instincts.

Orfeo, in seeing the hunting party of the Faery King, catches a glimpse of the anatural world, but only vaguely does he understand

[14] "The Structure of *Sir Orfeo*," *Medieval Studies,* 23 (1961), 137.

[15] John Block Friedman, "Eurydice, Heurodis, and the Noon-Day Demon," *Speculum,* 41 (1966), 22–29.

what he sees. He has not yet the power or the means by which to objectify and order his experience of the anatural. Following the hunting party, he comes into "a fair cuntray / As bright so sonne on somers day" and discovers there a castle so beautiful that he thinks it is "the proude court of Paradis":

Amidde the lond a castel he sighe,
Riche and regal, and wonder heighe.
Al the utmost was
Was clere and shine as cristal.
An hundred tours ther were about,
Degiselich, and batailed stout;
The butras com out of the diche,
Of rede gold y-arched riche;
The vosour was a-wowed al
Of each maner divers animal.
Within ther were wide wones
Al of precious stones.
The werst piler on to biholde
Was al of burnist gold.
Al that lond was ever light,
For when it schuld be therk and night,
The riche stones light gonne
As bright as doth at none the sonne.
No man may telle, no thinke in thought
The riche werk that ther was wrought;
By al thing him think that it is
The proude court of Paradis.
(331–52)

But entering within the castle, Orfeo is confronted with a different sight:

Than he gan behild about al,
And seighe a foule liggeand within the wal
Of folk that were thider y-brought,
And thought dede, and nare nought.
Sum stode withouten hade,
And sum non armes hade,
And sum thurch the bodi hadde wounde,
And sum lay wode, y-bounde.
And sum armed on hors sete,
And sum a-strangled as thay ete,
And sum were in water adreynt,

And sum with fire al forschreynt;
Wives ther lay on child bedde,
Sum ded, and sum awedde;
And wonder fele ther lay bisides,
Right as they slepe her undertides.
(363–78)

The two passages comment upon the nature of illusion and reality and, as such, invite comparison with the court scene in Guillaume de Lorris' *Le Roman de la Rose.* As the lover in de Loriss' romance approaches the castle, he sees the figures of Hate, Felony, Villainy, Covetousness, Avarice, Envy, Sorrow, Old Age, the hypocrite Pope Holy, and Poverty sculptured upon the garden wall. Once inside the garden, the lover describes a different sight:

And whan I was / ther / in, iwys,
Myn herte was ful glad of this,
For wel wende I ful sykerly
Haue ben in paradyse erthly;
So fayre it was that, trusteth well,
It seemed a place espyrituell.
For certes, as at my deuyse,
There is no place in paradyse
So good in for to dwell or be
As in that garden thought me;[16]
(645–54)

The movement from the beautiful to the grotesque in *Sir Orfeo* is reversed in de Lorris' *Le Roman de la Rose.* This fact may be significant as a comment upon love, it its nature be, as the character Reason would have it, illusory after all. Clearly the alternation between illusion and reality in *Sir Orfeo* manifests the poet's view that in the complexity of human life man is constantly challenged to discover the essential nature of his existence.

In the castle of the Faery King, Orfeo sees his lost Queen Herodis, "slepe under an ympe-tre / By her clothes he knewe it was she." Queen Herodis, as the poem later confirms, remains unchanged by her experience. Orfeo, in contrast, who acts from his own volition,

16 *Le Roman de la Rose,* in *The Roumant of the Rose and Le Roman de la Rose,* ed. Ronald Sutherland (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1968). All references are to this text.

gains a great deal of understanding from his ten-year exile and his recovery of Herodis. He no longer acts in ignorance or defiance of the laws of the universe. He gains entrance to the Faery King's court through his humility and, even more importantly, through his art:

> Orfeo knokketh atte gate.
> The porter was redi therate
> And asked what he wold have y-do.
> "Parfay!" quat he, "ich-am a minstrel, lo!
> To solas thi lord with my gle,
> Yif his swete wille be."
> (355–60)

Presented to the Faery King who at first is hostile to Orfeo's presence and demands to know, "What man artow / That art hider y-comen now?" Orfeo wins the king's favor through the "blisseful notes" of his harp. In return for the entertainment Orfeo has provided, the king grants him his wish and Orfeo recovers his lost queen. Critics are quick to point out that this scene represents the transference of fourteenth-century courtly conventions onto the underworld and, thus, Orfeo's manners, grace, and humility are recognized and rewarded in the underworld as they would be in any medieval court.[17] They cite as proof of their contention the king's ability to be bound by his promise and his sense of honor. Ultimately, they assert that not Orfeo's art wins Herodis for him but the conventions of courtly life.

Such an interpretation is, at best, a misreading. Orfeo's first meeting with the Faery King is marked by hostility and anger. The king demands to know who Orfeo is and what he wants. The Faery King says to Orfeo:

> "I no fond never so folehardi man
> That hider to ous durst wende,
> Bot that ich him wald of sende."
> (402–404)

The king's pose is hardly one of the grace, courtesy, and hospitality associated with courtly conventions and with medieval society. The

[17] See especially Loomis, *op. cit.*; Kane, *op. cit.*; and Dorena Allen, "Orpheus and Orfeo: The Dead and the Taken," *Medium Aevum*, 33 (1964), 110.

important fact thus becomes that Orfeo wins the king's acceptance and favor through his music:

> That al that in the palays were
> Com to him for to here,
> And liggeth a-down to his fete,
> Hem thenketh his melody so swete.
> The king herkneth and sitt ful stille,
> To here his gle he hath gode wille,
> Gode bourde he hadd of his gle,
> The riche quen also hadde she.
> (415–22)

What emerges from this scene in the palace of the Faery King is not a transferred depiction of medieval court life but a significant statement about art's power to tame the irrational. Art's power to impose order upon chaos is emphasized, and Orfeo's recovery of Herodis marks only a further extension of that power. Orfeo has earned the king's promise and has recovered Herodis through the power of his art. His art has conquered the anatural world and has enabled both Herodis and Orfeo to return to the world of human society. Orfeo's efforts as a king to control the anatural failed; but as a pilgrim-artist his efforts to know and his attempts to control that world succeeded. He returns to his society a man changed by his experiences. He now knows himself in relation to one aspect of the universe, one state of being or consciousness about which previously he had been both proud and ignorant. The association of the Orpheus-Eurydice myth with the myths of Dis and Prosperina in Celtic mythology[18] is here significant, for what is emphasized in the final sections of *Sir Orfeo* is rebirth—both in terms of the individual and society. The poet speaks not only literally but symbolically when he states:

> Now King Orfeo newe coround is.

Sir Orfeo has become the true pilgrim-artist, a man aware of art's intrinsic power to reconcile the individual with the natural and anatural forces against which man must contend for the realization of his own identity.

18 Davies, pp. 162–63.

Villainy in Scott's Fiction

by George W. Boswell

The natural disposition and career of Sir Walter Scott were so generally sunny that only a small handful of his many critics have seriously faulted any aspects of his character. Occasional objections have been adduced to the mystification and possible harshness of his business dealings with the Ballantynes, the maintenance of his incognito with respect to authorship of the Waverley novels long beyond any credible reason for it, his jealousy of Robert Burns (though if existent this is certainly not very noticeable), and some of his Chesterfieldian letters to his son and heir; but these have seemed to pale into insignificance when set alongside his moral virtues. The latter include his industry, his openhandedness, his capacity for extensive friendships, his civil services, the generous praise of the literary productions of his contemporaries, and above all the heroic stoicism with which "in his fifty-sixth year, already in uncertain health, he assumed a mountain of debt and sentenced himself to a lifetime of servitude"[1] in order to avoid bankruptcy and its stigma. These strengths have moved his latest biographer, Edgar Johnson, to write, "Of all the British men of letters of the nineteenth century he is the noblest and the wisest."[2]

Such a nature and life honored by unbounded adulation would not appear propitious to the preparation of a novelist, who is expected to be able to delineate among other states the deepest depravation of the human heart. Some of this deficiency may indeed be seen in Scott. Not altogether inappropriately Hutton calls him "a conventional moralist,"[3] Fischer writes that "his novels bear no intimate relation to his own convictions or experience,"[4] Baker adds that "sheer villainy he never could understand; it always landed him in the bog of

1 Edgar Johnson, *Sir Walter Scott: The Great Unknown* (New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 971.

2 Ibid., p. 1279.

3 Richard H. Hutton, *Sir Walter Scott* (New York: Harper [1878]), p. 125.

4 Frank Elmer Fischer, "Social and Political Ideas in Scott's Fiction," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XV (1955 [1950]), 581.

melodrama,"[5] and according to Henderson, "His merely villainous creations, whether of the diabolically clever order like Rashleigh, or the somewhat commonplace sort of Lord Dalgarno, or the low and depraved kind of his eminence of Whitefriars—grossly impressive after a fashion though he be—are all a little stagey."[6] But these observations are simplistic and superficial; closer scrutiny reveals a considerable trenchancy, realism, and variety among Scott's villains.[7] He has no Iago—but who has except Shakespeare? But he has a Richard Varney, a Valentine Bulmer, a Henbane Dwining, a Lady Ashton, and an Edward Christian. The present article is designed as an essay in analysis of evil among the many characters[8] in his twenty-six novels and additional handful of short story-like pieces, partially to set the record straight but primarily to throw light on Scott's evaluation of villainies at least on the evidence of his prose fiction.

In the "Introductory Note" to *A Dictionary of the Characters in The Waverley Novels of Sir Walter Scott*[9] M. F. A. Husband wrote, "No fewer than 2836 characters are comprised in the Dictionary, and these include 37 horses and 33 dogs." It may be assumed that close to two thousand of the human characters appear at sufficient length to evidence their nature. Among them we can classify 111 as villains, of which only seventeen are major villains. Subjective distinction must play a part in these figures. For example, though obviously at least one member of the precious law firm of Greenhorn and Grinderson in *The Antiquary* is a grasping knave, he is omitted here because of his insignificance. Major villains differ from minor mostly in the extent to which they are displayed. Fewer than 1% of his characters, then, are major villains, and only about 5% tend substantially in that direction. One of the novels (*Castle Dangerous*) includes no villains at all, half of them no major villains, and only one (*The Fair Maid*

[5] Ernest A. Baker, *The History of the English Novel* (London: Witherby, 1935), VI, 210.

[6] T. F. Henderson, "Sir Walter Scott," in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge: University Press, 1915), XII, 21.

[7] Who certainly merit a short study if his protagonists deserve a book, like Alexander Welsh's *The Hero of the Waverley Novels* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963).

[8] "Scott has the most crowded canvas of any European novelist"—Christina Keith, *The Author of Waverley* (New York: Roy Publishers, 1964), p. 171.

[9] (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1910.)

of Perth) contains three major villains.[10] In chronological order of publication let us get the facts before us.

Waverley. No major, five minor
Richard Waverley, political plotter
Fergus Mac Ivor, not really evil, just proud and high-handed
Malcolm Bradwardine, greedy
Donald Bean Lean, robber, turncoat
Balmawhapple, vengeful carouser

Guy Mannering. No major, three minor
Sophie Mannering, deceitful, scheming
Gilbert Glossin, ambitious, unscrupulous (but not totally evil)
Dirk Hatteraick, brutal smuggler

The Antiquary. No major, two minor
Herman Dousterswivel, swindler
Joscelind, Countess of Glenallan, magisterial, selfish, unyielding

The Black Dwarf. No major, three minor
Willie Graeme of Westburnflat, unforgiving raider
Sir Frederick Langley, ambitious, traitorous
Richard Vere, selfish, deceitful, ambitious

Old Mortality. Two major, four minor
JOHN BURLEY, cruel religious enthusiast
BASIL OLIFANT, ambitious grabber
Claverhouse, harsh warrior
Francis Stuart, also not really evil, just a swaggering adventurer
Habakkuk Mucklewrath, insane preacher
Ephraim Macbriar, religious enthusiast

Rob Roy. One major, two minor
RASHLEIGH OSBALDISTONE, scheming, licentious traitor
Joseph Jobson, unscrupulous lawyer
Andrew Fairservice, boastful, cowardly

The Heart of Midlothian. No major, four minor
John Porteous, cruel officer
Meg Murdockson, inveterate hater
George Staunton, not really evil, just a willful young rake
Whistler, victim of circumstances, environment

The Bride of Lammermoor. One major, three minor

10 Similarly, only *King Lear* among Shakespeare's plays has four major villains.

LADY ASHTON, heartless tyrant
Bucklaw, reckless adventurer
Captain Craigengelt, capitalizing toady
Ailsie Gourlay, deceptive fortune-teller

A Legend of Montrose. No major, three quite minor
Marquis of Argyle, underhanded, cowardly
Allan McAulay, violent, ungovernable enthusiast
Ranald MacEagh, vindictive, violent

Ivanhoe. Two major, five minor
BRIAN DE BOIS-GUILBERT, religious hypocrite
REGINALD FRONT-DE-BOEUF, cruel tyrant
Prince John, cowardly traitor
Waldemar Fitzurse, ambitious traitor
Maurice de Bracy, reckless self-seeker
Ulrica, frenzied avenger
Lucas de Beaumanoir, persecuting enthusiast

The Monastery. One major, two minor
JULIAN AVENEL, lawless, grasping nobleman
Christie of the Clinthill, swaggering dependent (by no means altogether bad)
Sir Piercie Shafton, not really evil, just boastful and proud

The Abbot. No major, two quite minor
Roland Graeme, protagonist, willful, haughty
Lord William Ruthven, also not really villainous, stern, harsh

Kenilworth. One major, four minor
RICHARD VARNEY, revengeful, murderous self-seeker
Michael Lambourne, swaggering, drunken crony
Anthony Foster, religious hypocrite, grasping
Leicester, ambitious, selfish
Alasco, complaisant alchemist

The Pirate. No major, three quite minor
Bryce Snailsfoot, deceptive peddler
Neil Ronaldson, avaricious, dishonest
Mrs. Swertha, petty plunderer, cheater

The Fortunes of Nigel. One major, two minor
MALCOLM DALGARNO, hypocrite, heartless
Captain John Colepepper, coward, murderer
Lutin, liar, thief, murderer

Peveril of the Peak. One major, six minor
EDWARD CHRISTIAN, revenge
Duke of Buckingham, reckless traitor
Dr. Titus Oates, religious liar
Colonel Thomas Blood, murderer
Tom Chiffinch, luxurious pander
Captain Dangerfield, self-seeking informer
Captain of Newgate, spidery, grasping
Quentin Durward. One major, five minor
WILLIAM DE LA MARCK, cruel nobleman
Campo-Basso, ambitious, toadying
Tristan L'Hermite, cruel executioner
Oliver le Diable, unscrupulous counsellor
Hayraddin Maugrabin, double-dealing atheist
John Cardinal Balue, proud traitor
St. Ronan's Well. One major, one minor
VALENTINE BULMER, ambitious, heartless hater
Sir Bingo Binks, ill-tempered, brutish nobleman
Redgauntlet. No major, three minor
Cristal Nixon, brutal traitor
Thomas Trumbull, hypocritical smuggler
Father Crackenthorp, conspirator
The Betrothed. No major, three minor
Prince John (again), irritant, trouble-maker
Randal de Lacy, black sheep, ambitious supplanter
Wild Wenlock, licentious brawler
The Talisman. No major, two minor
Conrade, Marquis of Montserrat, trouble-maker
Giles Amaury, murderous traitor
Woodstock. No major, five minor
Charles II, self-indulgent
General Harrison, cruel, ambitious enthusiast
Roger Wildrake, not really evil—dissolute, brawling, swaggering
Joseph Tomkins, enthusiastic, licentious hypocrite
Merciful Strickalthrow, cruel enthusiast
"The Two Drovers." No major, two minor
John Fleecebumpkin, unscrupulous trouble-maker
Ralph Heskett, bad-tempered, overbearing

"The Highland Widow." No major, one minor
Miles MacPhadraick, selfish
"The Surgeon's Daughter." No major, five minor
Prince Tippoo Sahib, self-indulgent
Richard Middlemas (protagonist), ambitious hater
Richard Tresham, double-dealer, deserter
Adela Montreville, wrathful, self-indulgent
Tom Hillary, hater
The Fair Maid of Perth. Three major, three minor
DUKE OF ALBANY, ambitious, deceitful
SIR JOHN RAMORNY, vindictive murderer
HENBANE DWINING, sadistic, atheistic, traitorous
Duke of Rothsay, willful, profligate
Conachar, coward, quarrelsome
Anthony Bonthron, unfeeling, drunken
"My Aunt Margaret's Mirror." No major, two minor
Sir Philip Forester, selfish, heartless
Baptista Damiotti, quack
Anne of Geierstein. One major, four minor
COUNT ARCHIBALD VON HAGENBACH, grasping, cruel
Count de Campo-Basso (again), traitor
Ital Schreckenwald, cruel, unscrupulous
Rudolph Donnerhugel, ambitious warmonger
Brother Bartholomew, robber, hypocrite
Count Robert of Paris. One major, two minor
MICHAEL AGELASTES, ambitious hypocrite[11]
Nicephorus Briennius, licentious, ambitious
Achilles Tatius, ambitious, cowardly
Castle Dangerous. None at all.

Scott is too wise a writer to depict his characters in only blacks and whites.[12] As is evident above, many of those we have labeled as evil are only partially so; and ever so many of the virtuous people, even protagonists, have their faults. Roland Graeme and Henry Smith are full-bodied studies in mixed traits, Waverley and Nigel seem really weak and unpromising, and even Morton might have selected his

11 "Agelastes masquerades as a stoic philosopher but is a secret voluptuary...; now he schemes to ascend the throne as the embodiment of Plato's dream of a philosopher king." Johnson, p. 1212.

12 "My rogue," he says, "always, in despite of me, turns out my hero."

principles with a steadier hand. Callum Beg tried to kill Waverley from ambush, Rob Roy was a large-scale reiver, Sir William Ashton serves as a pale satellite to his masterful wife, and the pride and prejudices of such men as Richard I, Colonel Philip Talbot, Guy Mannering, Claverhouse, and Count Robert of Paris caused them great unnecessary trouble. Among Scott's strengths are his humorous originals: Bradwardine, Sir Geoffrey Peveril, Sir Arthur Wardour, Jonathan Oldbuck, and David Deans.

Now, in order to arrive as best we can at an overview of the species of villainy with which he most concerns himself, let us classify the characters by principal infraction. Major villains only, by types:

1. Ambitious traitors: Albany, Rashleigh Osbaldistone, Agelastes, Olifant
2. Scheming noblemen: Ramorny, Dalgarno, Varney, Bulmer
3. Reckless, lawless barons: De la Marck, Front de Boeuf, de Hagenbach, Julian Avenel
4. Offenders against religion: Bois-Guilbert, Burley
5. Haters: Christian, Dwining
6. Women: Lady Ashton (overbearing hater)

and by fault:

1. Greed, ambition: Varney, Rashleigh, Bulmer, de Hagenbach, Albany, Front de Boeuf, Olifant, Avenel, Agelastes
2. Cruelty, callousness: Dalgarno, De la Marck, Burley
3. Pride: Ashton, Dwining
4. Revenge: Christian, Ramorny
5. Hypocrisy: Bois-Guilbert

At least most of the villains appear in the following table. Major figures head the list.

1. Ambitious traitors: Albany, Rashleigh, Agelastes, Olifant, Campo-Basso, Tatius, Conrade, Balue
2. Scheming noblemen: Ramorny, Dalgarno, Bulmer, Charles II, Prince John, de Lacy, Argyle,[13] Briennius, Langley, Vere
3. Reckless noblemen: De la Marck, Front de Boeuf, de Hagenbach, Avenel, Buckingham, Bucklaw, Balmawhapple, de Bracy, Staunton
4. Religious hypocrites, enthusiasts: Bois-Guilbert, Burley, Gen-

[13] Scott "hardly ever—and only when, as in the case of the marquis of Argyle, his political prejudices are strongly stirred—manifests an unfairness that verges on spite." Henderson, p. 21.

eral Harrison, Amaury, Beaumanoir, Oates, Trumbull, Strickalthrow, Mucklewrath, Macbriar, Foster, Tomkins
5. Companions: Varney, Lambourne, Wildrake, Nixon, Christie, Craigengelt, Bothwell, Fitzurse, Schreckenwald, Chiffinch
6. Ruffians: Bean Lean, Hatteraick, Bonthron, Fleecebumpkin, L'Hermite, Dangerfield, Blood, Colepepper
7. Haters: Christian, Dwining, Forester, Middlemas
8. Women: Ashton, Glenallan, Murdockson, Gourlay
9. Lawyers, magistrates: Glossin, Jobson, Ronaldson
10. Scientists, quacks: Alasco, Dousterswivel, Damiotti

One of his critics writes, "He could not effectually use the same subject twice."[14] When he endeavored to repeat a similar villainous character, as in another area Norna of the Fitful Head is something of an unsuccessful copy of Meg Merrilies, did he normally fail? His lawless barons, Front de Boeuf, Julian Avenel, William De la Marck, and Archibald de Hagenbach, are certainly tarred with the same brush. Likewise, compare unfavorably Lady Glenallan with Lady Ashton, Ailsie Gourlay with Meg Murdockson, Merciful Strickalthrow with Habakkuk Mucklewrath, Cristal Nixon with Christie of the Clinthill, and Joseph Jobson with Gilbert Glossin.

Judging from the number of semi-major villains who are primarily guilty of them, this is the order of enormity among Scott's figures:

Rank	*Infraction*	*Number of Villains*
1.	Greed	16
2.	Cruelty	10
3.	Treason	7
4.	Recklessness, dissipation	7
5.	Morality, sex	6
6.	Pride	4
7.	Religious enthusiasm	3
8.	Superstitious fraud	3
9.	Revenge	3
10.	Cowardice	2

Do they correspond closely to the medieval Seven Deadly Sins? Not very.

14 Hutton, p. 96.

Avarice	16	
Anger	10	
Gluttony	7	
Lust	6	
Pride	4	
Envy	2	(except generally, as combined with ambition)
Sloth	0	(Scott's villains are by no means lazy)

And how about the Christian virtues?[15] Violation of:

Unworldliness	32
Purity	25
Benevolence	20
Humility	14
Obedience	13

How do Scott's villainous characters compare with those of another author, for example Shakespeare? There are only twenty-six of the latter, or an average of 2/3rds of one per play. They may be listed as follows:

Richard III	Claudius
Tyrrel	Achilles
Aaron	Iago
Proteus	Angelo
Tybalt	Edmund
John	Goneril
Shylock	Regan
Prince John	Cornwall
Don John	Macbeth
Scroop	Lady Macbeth
Duke Frederick	Cloten
Oliver	Cymbeline's Queen
Cassius	Antonio

and their principal evil:

Fault	*Number of Characters*
Ambition	5

15 As formulated in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, eleventh edition (1910), IX, 821.

Greed	4
Cruelty	4
Jealous Hatred	4
Lechery	4
Pride	2
Lying	2
Treason	1
	26

Of course, in the same way that few villains are as whole-hearted as Dalgarno and De la Marck,[16] there is, as implied above, appreciable actual or potential evil scattered among the favorable characters. Unlike Shakespeare, who used three villainous protagonists (of course, all kings, they were imposed on him by their plots), Scott uses none. The closest he comes is in Roland Graeme, merely impetuous and willful, and Henry Smith, who is merely a roisterer and fighter. Edgar Ravenswood possesses no bad qualities except excessive family pride. If Louis XI were a protagonist the practice would be imperiled, for his character has little to recommend it; but (like Oliver Cromwell in *Woodstock*) he is only a background figure for Quentin Durward. Similar figures are Alexius Comnenus, Byzantine emperor who holds his position by craft and guile; James I, credulous, cowardly, eavesdropping; Redgauntlet, single-minded Jacobite; and Charles the Bold, ambitious, splenetic, and overbearing. Cadwallon dedicated himself to the extermination of his lord's enemy, Effie Deans remained selfish and inconsiderate, Nelly Christie yielded to the seductiveness of Lord Dalgarno, Nanty Ewert was drinking himself to death, Hispeth Mucklebackit committed and concealed guilty deeds, Helen MacGregor condemned a defenseless man to death in cold blood, and Ursula Suddlechop delighted in backstage wirepulling. Hardly anything favorable can be advanced for the characters of Lady Binks, Thorncliff Osbaldistone, and Kate Chiffinch.

Taking into consideration the operation of all kinds of evil in circumstance, society, hero, villain, and supporting characters, we arrive at the following list. At least for purposes of his fiction it may be thought of as Scott's weighted evaluation of enormity.

16 "William the Boar, enemy to every kind of order and humanity." Francis R. Hart, *Scott's Novels* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), p. 232.

Rank	*Infraction*	*Appearance: in Number of Novels*
1.	Application of force or corruption[17]	12
2.	Greed, covetousness, ambition	11
3.	Religious enthusiasm, intolerance, superstition[18]	8
4.	Cruelty[19]	7
5.	Rebellion against government (Jacobitism)	5
6.	Treason[20]	4
7.	Feudal oppression[21]	3
8.	Pride, willfulness	3
9.	Hatred	3
10.	Profligacy[22]	3
11.	Discord, gossip	2
12.	Suspicion, deception	2
13.	Cowardice[23]	2
14.	Revenge	1
15.	Undisciplined education[24]	1
		68

As Fischer says, "The novels . . . do reveal . . . a contempt for all those who would trample on tradition and dissolve man's attachment to his family, his religion, and his country" (p. 581). Treason, rebellion, hypocrisy, quarrelsomeness, and dishonesty loom high indeed in Scott's obloquy, to the extent that he almost seems to be writing parable, to be seeking characters who objectify on the personal level public faults; but ambitious greed is at the very top of the hierarchy. There is a delicious irony here in that his contemporaries accused

17 Mostly of a girl to marry an unloved suitor, as is *The Black Dwarf, The Bride of Lammermoor, Quentin Durward, St. Ronan's Well, The Betrothed,* and *The Talisman*; occasionally of a young man, as of Nigel and Darsie Latimer.

18 As in *Old Mortality, Ivanhoe,* and *The Abbot.* "Of enthusiasm in religion Scott always spoke very severely," Hutton, p. 126.

19 As in the Porteous riots, the treatment of Mary Queen of Scots and Amy Robsart, and *Quentin Durward* and *The Fair Maid of Perth.*

20 Prince John and Fitzurse in *Ivanhoe,* Buckingham in *Peveril of the Peak,* Nixon in *Redgauntlet,* and Agelastes, Briennius, and Tatius in *Count Robert of Paris.*

21 In *Guy Mannering* (Ellangowan's removal of the poachers), *The Monastery,* and *Anne of Geierstein.*

22 In *The Pirate, The Fortunes of Nigel,* and *The Fair Maid of Perth.*

23 Argyle and Conachar.

24 Waverley.

him above all himself of that very fault. Even as early as 1808 (published 1809), a half-decade before his first novel, in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* Byron was sneering as follows:

> And think'st thou, SCOTT! by vain conceit perchance,
> On public taste to foist thy stale romance,
> Though MURRAY with his MILLER may combine
> To yield thy muse just half-a-crown per line?
> No! when the sons of song descend to trade,
> Their bays are sear, their former laurels fade,
> Let such forego the poet's sacred name,
> Who rack their brains for lucre, not for fame. . . .
> And thou too, SCOTT! resign to minstrels rude
> The wilder slogan of a border feud:
> Let others spin their meagre lines for hire.
> (ll. 171–178, 911–913)

Could it be that greed was Sir Walter's besetting and almost sole fault and that he placed it foremost in his fictional villainy in ironic effort at expiation?

Thomas More and Lucian: A Study in Satiric Influence and Technique*

by Warren W. Wooden

After Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, Thomas More's *Utopia* is perhaps the most controversial product of sixteenth century English literature. Near the center of the controversy over More's methods, aims, and means in the *Utopia* lie the twin problems of the genre and literary heritage of his strange work. I suggest that the *Utopia* is modelled upon and may be most profitably studied in conjunction with the literature of classical satire. Specifically, I will first assemble the evidence of More's acquaintanceship with and admiration for the 2nd century A.D. Greek satirist, Lucian of Samosata. The central character in the *Utopia*, Raphael Hythloday, will then be considered as a satiric persona and other evidence of Lucianic techniques will be studied. Finally, the *Utopia* will be canvassed from the standpoint of classical Lucianic or Menippean satire—to adopt the modern term for satire of the Lucianic variety employed by Northroy Frye, Alvin Kernan and others—as evidence for a generic classification.[1]

More's study of the works of Lucian of Samosata, the classical master of prose satire, forms one of the most curiously neglected chapters of *Utopia* criticism. Despite More's translations from the Greek satirist, his demonstrably close familiarity with the corpus of his work, and the high praise for Lucian with which his correspondence is sprinkled, the great majority of More scholars studiously ignore the possibility of affinities between the satire of Lucian and that of the

* This essay is based upon a paper delivered at the West Virginia Association of College English Teachers in October, 1971. Much of the research upon which this study is based was supported by a Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation Research Grant during the summer of 1970.

[1] For an explanation of the term "Menippean Satire" and the conventions of this genre, see Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (1957, rpt.; New York: Atheneum, 1966), Alvin B. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), John M. Aden, "Toward a Uniform Satiric Terminology," *Satire Newsletter*, 1 (1964), 30–32, and Juanita S. Williams, "Toward a Definition of Menippean Satire," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966).

Utopia, a work admitted by all to be satirical in some degree.[2] This neglect is made more curious by the findings of the handful of scholars who have investigated the techniques and targets of the *Utopia* in the light of a Lucianic model.[3] Without exception these scholars conclude that there are striking parallels and similarities between the characteristic methods of Lucian and those of More in the *Utopia.*

Traditionally these critics willing to acknowledge the possibility of a positive, creative literary influence of Lucian upon More have focussed their studies either upon such minutia as that of borrowed nomenclature or, at the other extreme, broad theoretical similarities. As a result, an attempt to assess the extent and importance of Lucianic satiric strategy in the *Utopia* itself has yet to be undertaken even in the best of these studies. It is my intention in this paper to suggest several of the larger satiric techniques employed by More which seem most plausibly to derive from his study of Lucian. My purpose, then, is not to belabor real or imagined parallels between specific incidents in the Lucianic corpus and More's *Utopia,* but rather to illustrate a similar philosophic outlook and satiric stance in the Greek and the Englishman including comment upon the creative and original uses to which More put those satiric tactics which so delighted him in his study of Lucian.

2 For example, note the dismissal of Lucian in the preface to the Yale *Utopia*: "Lucian's extravagant fantasy and robust humor find a possible echo only in a touch here or there. . . ." (*Utopia,* ed. Edward Surtz and J. H. Hexter [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963] p. clxiii). This is the modern standard edition of the *Utopia,* and all subsequent citations of More's text will refer to this edition.

3 H. W. Donner, *An Introduction to Utopia,* (London: Sidgewick and Jackson, Ltd., 1945), and C. S. Lewis, *History of English Literature in the Sixteenth Century,* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), suggest a Lucianic model for the *Utopia.* C. R. Thompson, in *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., 1940) and also in "Lucian and Lucianism in the English Renaissance: An Introductory Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1937), has investigated the possibility in some detail and has concluded that the similarities between Lucian and the *Utopia* are too striking to be coincidental. In his illuminating article, "Satire in the *Utopia,*" *PMLA,* 78 (1963), 163–174, A. R. Heiserman detailed many generic similarities between Lucian's satire and the *Utopia.* Most recently, T. S. Dorsch, in "Sir Thomas More and Lucian: An Interpretation Of *Utopia,*" *Archiv fur das Studium der Neuren Sprachen und Literaturen,* 203 (1967), 345–363; an article which curiously does not mention the valuable work of either Thompson or Heiserman, concludes that More was heavily in Lucian's debt in the composition of one of "the two most beautifully developed and most consistently sustained works of Lucianic irony in English literature" (p. 362). To this writer's knowledge, no attempt has ever been made to rebut these critics' contentions.

Since the possibility of a positive Lucianic influence upon the *Utopia* has been suggested, it seems apposite here to examine first that portion of the evidence for such a thesis which concerns More's early study of Lucian. During 1505–1506, More and Erasmus initiated an extended study of Lucian, each of them translating into Latin a number of the satiric dialogues of the Samosatan. In 1506, a volume containing the translations of Lucian by More and Erasmus was printed by Badius in Paris, containing eighteen short dialogues and ten longer ones by Erasmus and three dialogues and a declamation, *Tyrannicida,* translated by More.

The three Lucianic dialogues which, in addition to the *Tyrannicida,* More chose to translate are the *Cynicus, Menippus* (Necromantia), and *Philopseudes.* The choice is an interesting one, and according to More's dedicatory epistle, its basis was purely personal: they struck his fancy.[4] A brief examination of the individual dialogues may aid in discovering what particular appeal these three satires held for More.

The *Cynicus* is a dialogue between a worldly young man and a Cynic philosopher, revolving about the reasons for the philosopher's choice of a hard and austere life. The dialogue, essentially a satire upon luxurious living, concludes with the Cynic's assertion that the simple life is the best, a conclusion which More, who wore a hair-shirt all of his adult life, would have heartily endorsed. Lucian's conclusion in this dialogue, a faithful reproduction of the philosophical position taken by the original Cynics, is also essentially the classical philosophic basis of Menippean satire: the mean and sure estate. More's endorsement of this philosophic position and his insistence upon its compatibility with the *contemptu mundi* tradition of Christianity are evinced in his dedicatory comments upon this dialogue. There More is explicit in stressing the common philosophic ground which he shared with the pagan satirist. More wrote that in this dialogue, "the severe life of the Cynics and their contented existence with few possessions is defended, the soft and enervating luxury of

[4] "For just as all men do not love the same maiden, but one prefers and loves a certain one, nor can he easily tell precisely why, but she simply suits his taste, so of the most agreeable dialogue of Lucian one man likes a certain one best, another prefers another; these ones have particularly struck my fancy, nor that merely by accident, I trust, nor they alone." (From the dedicatory epistle to the translations of Lucian, trans. by C. R. Thompson in *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More,* p. 25).

voluptaries is denounced. In the same work the simplicity, temperance, and frugality of the Christian life, and finally that strait and narrow way that leads to life are commended."[5]

In the *Menippus,* Lucian's target is the crowd of foolish philosophers, the *philosophi gloriosi* who bear the traditional brunt of the Menippean satirist's scorn. Menippus goes about to the philosophers of the different sects hoping to learn from them the correct manner in which to order his life. Each advises him to follow a different plan of life, all the while assuring Menippus that the philosopher's own sect possesses exclusive knowledge of the truth. Disgusted by the contradictions of the philosophers, Menippus journeys to the underworld to consult the seer Tiresias. The seer's advice to Menippus is simple and to the point:

> The life of the common sort is best, and you will act more wisely if you stop speculating about heavenly bodies and discussing final causes and first causes, spit your scorn at those clever syllogisms, and counting all that sort of thing nonsense, make it always your sole object to put the present to good use and to hasten on your way, laughing a great deal and taking nothing seriously.[6]

The *Menippus* is notable as an exceptionally fine example of the genre named for the Cynic philosopher-satirist. It contains most of the standard devices associated with the genre—the *philosophus gloriosus,* the voyage, both dialogue and narrative elements, a simple philosophic norm—all of which may be paralleled in the *Utopia.*

The third of the dialogues translated by More is the *Philopseudes,* which, while ostensibly a general satire on liars and the gullibility of their adherents, is primarily another indictment of foolish philosophers. The principal speaker, Tychiades, marvels at the credulity of men in putting their complete trust in all manner of outrageous prevarications. However his chief scorn is reserved for the philosophers, the lovers of wisdom, who should attempt to correct the errors of the common people. Instead, Tychiades finds that the philosophers are

[5] C. R. Thompson, *The Translations of Lucian,* p. 25. Compare the *Life of Pico,* where More wrote that "the golden mediocrity, the mean estate, is to be desired which shall bear us as it were in hands more easily, which shall obey us and not master us." (*The English Works of Sir Thomas More,* ed. W. E. Campbell [New York: Dial Press, 1931], I, 370).

[6] *Lucian,* trans. and ed. by A. M. Harmon (Leob Classical Library). 8 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1921), IV, 107–109.

the worst offenders, not only telling wilder tales than the rest, but even vouching for the authenticity of the monstrous lies promulgated by their fellow scholars.

Certainly it is difficult to overvalue More's admiration for the chief classical practitioner of Menippean satire. For despite Lucian's inevitable pagan lapses, there are no apologies for the Greek satirist in the dedicatory epistle which More affixed to his translations and no equivocations in his praise:

> If, most learned sir, there was ever anyone who fulfilled the Horatian precept and combined delight with instruction I think Lucian certainly stood *primus inter pares* in this respect. Refraining both from the arrogant teachings of the philosophers and the more dissolute dallyings of the poets, he everywhere remarks and censures, with very honest and at the same time very amusing wit, the shortcomings of mortals. And this he does so cleverly and so effectively that although no one pricks more deeply, yet there is no one of impartial mind who would not allow his stings of sarcasm.[7]

This is indeed heady praise, for in the sixteenth century the Horatian dictum was nearly the sole criteria for judging the worth of imaginative literature. On the basis of such testimony, taken in conjunction with More's peculiar native talents, his admiration for Lucian's philosophic position and his choice of satiric targets, it would be remarkable indeed if More composed a humorous prose work which did not bear the imprint of his close study and admiration of the Greek satirist.

In turning from a discussion of Lucian's attacks on narrow-minded philosophers to More's *Utopia,* our initial subject for examination will be its curious mariner-philosopher, Raphael Hythloday. In the Dialogue of Counsel in Book I, Hythloday and the fictional More figure find themselves dialectical opponents, and their conversation lays the foundation for Hythloday's development as a classical satiric persona. The fictional More argues that Hythloday, a public-spirited man of such great parts, should "do what is worthy of you and of this generous and truly philosophic spirit of yours if you so order your life as to apply your talent and industry to the public interest, even if it involves some personal disadvantages to yourself."[8] Hythloday's reply reveals the oversimplification of men and institutions that marks his whole philosophy and outlook. Hythloday will not go to

[7] C. R. Thompson, *The Translations of Lucian,* pp. 24–25.
[8] *Utopia,* p. 57.

court, first, because "almost all monarchs" occupy themselves in ignoble pursuits, self-aggrandizement, and insidious plotting.[9] In the second place, no one would heed him because at court "everyone is actually so wise as to have no need of profiting by another's counsel, or everyone seems so wise in his own eyes as not to condescend to profit by it."[10]

On the face of it, these pronouncements possess a measure of truth, and More doubtless would agree with them. But ultimately, one suspects, they reflect the simple-mindedness and kindred *alazoneia* of their spokesman. To Hythloday's mind, there are no complexities in the world; things are right or wrong, good or bad, black or white. He recognizes no shadings, no authentic humanity. It is on the basis of this world view, prompting him to systematize and categorize everything, that Hythloday condemns all things European and commends all things Utopian.

Also like the foolish philosophers of Lucian's dialogue, Hythloday's method of argument reveals his penchant for abstract theory and generalization. Hythloday never argues a point on the practical level. For example, as the chief point of his argument for the abolition of capital punishment in Europe, he points not to an example of a real state which functions successfully without capital punishment but to the example of the Polyerites, a people whom he had encountered on his travels and whose name, as the humanist fraternity would have recognized, means the "People of Much Nonsense." When pressed for logical proofs and concrete examples, Hythloday points consistently to the unreal, to the People of Much Nonsense to prove that capital punishment may be successfully abolished in the state; to the Achorians, the People without Place, to prove that bellicose imperialism is a self-defeating policy for a monarch; and, most pertinently, to the Utopians, the inhabitants of Nowhere, to prove that communism is the only economic basis for a good commonwealth and Epicurean hedonism its wisest official philosophy.

The identification of Hythloday with the *philosophus gloriosus* is reinforced throughout Book I. Having delivered himself on the corruption of those in high place and the uselessness of attempting to advise monarchs, Hythloday moves into a reminiscence of his trip

9 *Ibid.*
10 *Ibid.*

to England which completely contradicts the condemnation he has just uttered. While on his visit, Hythloday stayed at the home of Cardinal Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Chancellor of England, whom Hythloday praises for his sagacity, virtue, and similar fine qualities. Oblivious to the fact that he is contradicting his earlier speech, Hythloday recalls that "the king placed the greatest confidence in his advice, and the commonwealth seemed much to depend upon him when I was there."[11] At the same time he condemns, in a manner analogous to that of his earlier speech, the bad counsel of the Cardinal's retainers, lawyers, clerics, and the like. Still, Cardinal Morton displays no inclination to take any of this bad advice, nor does Hythloday intimate that he ever did. He does, on the other hand, question Hythloday intelligently and courteously and he shows every sign of having benefited from Hythloday's views. In fact, the Cardinal endorses Hythloday's opposition to capital punishment and says that its temporary abolition would be a worthwhile experiment in the state.

This encounter with Cardinal Morton affords a typical example of More's satiric method in conditioning his reader's reactions to the satiric persona Hythloday and consequently, by extension, to the Utopian world which Hythloday describes and endorses in Book II. The method seems not to have been noticed by critics of the *Utopia* and therefore warrants a brief analysis. It is, in its simplest form, a device of juxtapositions, between the theoretical, unreal, abstract, and erroneous on the one hand, and the practical, real, concrete, and reliable on the other. In the incident just referred to, Hythloday's earlier generalizations about the character of rulers and the ineffectuality of good advisors are directly contradicted through the concrete example, delivered by Hythloday himself, of a good and noble advisor who, again by Hythloday's own admission, is highly efficacious in directing his monarch to rule the state in the most virtuous manner. This advisor, though of high rank and himself the head of a household of retainers, is willing to listen to and learn from a stranger who would advise him.[12]

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 61.

12 And immediately preceeding his demonstration of the specious quality of his satiric persona's logic, More has added a fine ironic twist, after the manner of Lucian, by making Hythloday denounce in others the "proud, ridiculous and obstinate prejudices" of which he himself is so often a prime example. (*Ibid.*, p. 59)

This juxtaposition of theory and practice, general and particular, unreal and real, abstract and concrete, is operative throughout Book 1, and constitutes the major satiric technique by which More undercuts the credibility of his satiric persona and dissociates himself from Hythloday's judgments on Utopian institutions and practices.

This self-contradiction also takes the form of the denial or ignoring of a fact which is obvious to all but the speaker, as in Hythloday's assertion at the conclusion of Book I that he admires Utopian justice because "with very few laws, affairs are ordered so aptly that virtue has its reward. . . ."[13] This in face of the fact that if there ever were a law-ridden state, it is Utopia, and that it is precisely this plethora of laws which fascinates Hythloday in his account of the island.[14]

This method of discrediting the judgment of the satiric persona by setting real and practical against unreal and theoretical and allowing the persona to incriminate himself is a distinctly Menippean technique, for a prime example of which one need look no further than the Lucianic dialogue "The Lover of Lies," which More had translated earlier in his career.

The similarities between Hythloday and the Menippean *philosophus gloriosus* are apparent not only in Hythloday's abstract method of argumentation, but also in his world view touched upon earlier. Hythloday's rigorous intellectualism blinds him to the idiosyncracies, to the essential humaness, of humanity. His real interest is in systems not people. And he has the universal panacea, the simple solution to all of the troubles of mankind: communism.

According to Hythloday, the abolishment of private property will rapidly and inevitably bring about the eradication of injustice, inequality, poverty, and all the other ills of European society.[15] A

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[14] W. J. Barnes, who has also noted this particular contradiction, writes of Hythloday that "what he admires in Utopia is the fact that whenever and wherever Utopian human nature has shown any tendency toward irrational or subrational conduct, the Utopians have passed a law against it. This multiplicity of *rational* laws—some silly souls, less enlightened than Hythloday of course, have thought many of them absurd—these many laws are mentioned in almost every paragraph of Raphael's narration, though he tells us at one point that one of the great virtues of Utopia is there are but a few laws!" ("Irony and the English Apprehension of Renewal," *Queen's Quarterly*, 73 [1966], p. 368)

[15] It is interesting to note that this is a decidedly non-Christian position, denying original sin and implying the perfectability of man. This is a consideration which would hardly have escaped those humanists who, with tongue in cheek,

relatively simple change in the social system will cure all of man's problems. Hythloday's equation remains simple: communism works in the land of Nowhere, therefore it will work in Europe or anywhere. The fallacy of the equation is pointed out by the fictional More. In rebuttal to Hythloday's arguments, More attacks "this academic philosophy which thinks that everything is suitable to every place,"[16] and offers a pragmatic philosophy which embodies the attainable and the workable. More's argument for the practical rather than the theoretical takes the following form.

> But there is another philosophy, more practical for statesmen, which knows its stage, adapts itself to the play in hand, and performs its role neatly and appropriately. This is the philosophy which you must employ. Otherwise we have the situation in which a comedy of Plautus is being performed and the household slaves are making trivial jokes at one another and then you come on the stage in a philosopher's attire and recite the passage from *Octavia* where Seneca is disputing with Nero. Would it not have been preferable to take a part without words than by reciting something inappropriate to make a hodgepodge of comedy and tragedy? You would have spoiled and upset the actual play by bringing in the irrelevant matter—even if your contribution would have been superior in itself. Whatever play is being performed, perform it as best you can, and do not upset it all simply because you think of another which has more interest.
>
> So it is in the commonwealth. So it is in the deliberations of the monarchs. If you cannot pluck up the wrongheaded opinions by the root, if you cannot cure according to your heart's desire vices long standing, yet you must not on that account desert the commonwealth. You must not abandon the ship in a storm because you cannot control the winds.[17]

The basis for this condemnation is a clear and steady view of the world as it is, not simply as one would like it to be. It is a plea for the acceptance of reality and the adoption of a practical workable philosophy, and as such it shares common ground with the Menippean satirist. It is a straightforward condemnation of a closed philosophy which pretends to reduce the mutable world to a well-oiled, predictable and regulated, machine. More's reply may lack the vitriol of Lucian but the message is the same, and it is a distinctly Menippean

---

echo Hythloday's blanket endorsement of Utopian institutions in the prefatory letters.

16 *Utopia*, p. 99.

17 *Ibid.*

message.[18] And the motive is also that of the Menippean satirist: one does not abandon the ship because he cannot control the winds. Instead of turning his back on the real and searching for perfection, one writes, as Lucian had and as More on the title page of the *Utopia* proclaimed that he had, a work "No less Beneficial than Entertaining," to correct what faults one may, in the realization that some faults are too deeply embedded in the fabric of humanity ever to be totally eradicated. One writes in order that, as the fictional More puts it, "What you cannot turn to good you must make as little bad as you can."[19] Hythloday is so deeply imbued with the "academic philosophy" that he can tolerate, even if he is aware of, no other, and he rejects the fictional More's suggestion out of hand.[20]

More also manipulates his satiric persona in a manner characteristic of Menippean satire. Hythloday is used as both a target and a tool of More's satiric attack. As *philosophus gloriosus*, Hythloday's function is that of an *alazon*.[21] In this role More employs him to expose the folly of the argumentative technique and philosophic position he embodies. His view of the evil in the world as springing from a social root rather than a fundamentally humane one is discredited both by his own words and by the speeches of the fictional More. In typically Menippean fashion, however, More builds upon the good intention and moral character of his satiric persona so as to secure the advantages of *eiron* as well as *alazon*. However much Hythloday's philosophical position is undercut, his personal good intentions and high moral purpose are never impugned. It is as a good, public-spirited, if misguided, man that Hythloday is employed by the author as an *eiron* to attack existing vice and corruption in sixteenth-century Europe. Thus, in the dual use of his satiric persona, More is able to have it both ways, to both agree and disagree, to laugh at and commend his persona's various attacks on European society and praise of Utopian institutions. The technique is a favorite among Menippean satirists, perhaps the most famous non-classical example being Swift's

18 See Juanita S. Williams, "Towards a Definition of Menippean Satire," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966), p. 5.

19 *Utopia*, p. 101.

20 *Ibid.*

21 The terms *alazon* and *eiron*, respectively the foolish intellectual imposter and the shrewd under-player, are borrowed from classical comedy. See David Worchester's *The Art of Satire* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1969) and Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism* for discussions of the two as natural adversaries in classical satire.

Gulliver.[22] This dual function of Hythloday is the most thoroughly Menippean characteristic of More's use of the satiric persona.

This combination of *alazoneia* and *eironeia* in a single figure has perplexed critics. As *eiron* in Book I, the facet of his character traditionally emphasized by critics, Hythloday continually pierces through the sham, hypocrisy, and cant of sixteenth-century Europe. It is Hythloday who makes the famous accusation that enclosure has become so wide-spread in England that men no longer live off the sheep; rather the sheep now devour Englishmen. It is he who inveighs against the idle and wasteful nobility and their retainers, against a standing professional army in peace-time and against the unscrupulous policies of European monarchs. And there is must truth in the *eiron*'s charges. The evils and abuses did indeed exist; but the remedies proposed are often more radical and destructive than the evils intended to cure. Here the *eiron* becomes *alazon.*

The *alazon* is not interested in reforming the abuses in a human, and hence imperfect, system. His solution is to abolish it and erect in its place a perfect system, Utopianism. This is the perfect pattern which the *philosophus gloriosus* will impose upon a mutable world of fallible human beings; and of course it will not work. One of the fundamental lessons of Menippean satire is that the *philosophus gloriosus*' schemes never do or can bring perfection, perfect order, from the changeable world of man, ruled by fortune.[23] The reality which is overlooked in Hythloday's systematizing will not be denied. The fictional More points directly to the chief obstacle to all of Hythloday's proposals: humanity itself. The problem is, as More says, that "it is impossible that all should be well unless all men were good, a situation which I do not expect for a great many years to come!"[24]

As *alazon,* Hythloday is sure that he has discovered the cure-all in

[22] Some, but by no means all, of the similarities between More's technique and that of Swift in *Gulliver's Travels* have been explored by John Traugott in "A Voyage to Nowhere with Thomas More and Jonathan Swift," *Sewanee Review,* 69 (1961), 534–65. Apparently the similarities between More and Rabelais have not been explored, an odd circumstance since More is obviously one of Rabelais' masters. It is worth remembering that Pantagruel is one-half Utopian, his mother being queen of Amaurotum, the capital city of Utopia. And he is hailed as the savior of Utopia when he, along with Panurge and their companions, repel the invasion of the Dipsodes and rescue that nation.

[23] Juanita S. Williams, "Towards a Definition of Menippean Satire," p. 48.

[24] *Utopia,* p. 101.

Utopianism. He is so sure that he will have no part of what he regards as the half-measures of the fictional More's practical philosophy, to make as little bad as possible what you cannot turn to good. For the *philosophus gloriosus,* everything can be turned to good if only his system is adopted. Here two prominent attributes of Hythloday's *alazoneia* are apparent: his overreaching and his intellectual pride. His reply to the fictional More's advice of a practical philosophy is a curt one:

> By this approach, . . . I should accomplish nothing else than to share the madness of others as I tried to cure their lunacy. If I would stick to the truth, I must needs speak in the manner I have described. To speak falsehoods, for all I know, may be the part of a philosopher, but it is certainly not for me.[25]

Thus the final irony of the *philosophus gloriosus.* He will not accommodate himself to things as they are, even far enough to attempt to persuade a monarch to institute some or all of the Utopian practices. He will not go to court. He will not act. He only talks, preaches. Hythloday's world is words, not things, or human beings: he can only juggle abstractions and he respects only statistics.

Opposed to the needless complexities and impossible system-mongering of the *philosophus gloriosus* there exists in the text itself only the philosophical position which holds that the simple, practical, and common-sensical are man's best and truest guides to a mutable world he never made and never could hope to completely and effectively control.

This normative attitude is most explicit in Book I. It is there expressed directly as an ideal by the fictional More and illustrated in practice by the example of Cardinal Morton.[26] The norm is much

[25] *Ibid.* The Lucianic irony of Hythloday's last sentence is obvious. The use of the madness in this passage is also Menippean. It is the madman, the *philosophus gloriosus,* who believes that only he is sane and that it is the rest of the world which has gone mad.

[26] Harry Berger, Jr. has noted Cardinal Morton's normative function but he tends to view Morton as *the* norm in the *Utopia* rather than as only one source of it. According to Berger, "More has placed the contrast to all these Utopian methods, and the criteria by which they are to be judged, in the figure of Cardinal Morton." ("The Renaissance Imagination: Second World and Green World," *Centennial Review,* 9 [1956], 70) His position is adopted and further argued by Robbin S. Johnson, *More's Utopia: Ideal and Illusion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), pp. 59–60. The difficulty here is that Morton is simply not prominent enough in the narrative to function as a norm for the work as a whole. In

stronger or more insistent and obvious in Book I than in Book II, where it is largely implict and residual. As a sane and steady counterpoise both in theory and practice to the sophistical fantasies of Hythloday, it functions as the reader's guide to the torrent of ideas, propositions, and arguments which flow from Hythloday.

This consideration leads to another of some importance, the manner in which characterization is handled in the *Utopia.* The work opens with realistic descriptions of the characters; and, although all the characters exist in a work of fiction and are themselves fictional, several of them, Thomas More, Peter Giles, and later in the narrative, Cardinal Morton, bear the names, traits, and known characteristics of real people. These characters are nevertheless, in this context, fictional, and as in such satiric dialogues as Lucian's *Philosophies for Sale,* their resemblance to their living prototypes is distorted by the author to serve satiric purposes. In the early portion of Book I, the fictional More appears to have a touch of the ingenue about him; Giles, who appears only sporadically in Book I and not at all in Book II, is more credulous than More; and Cardinal Morton is aggrandized into a personification of virtue, wisdom, and piety. The realistic aspect of the characterization is clearly subordinate to the author's interest in the mental and philosophical attitudes of his fictional characters which controls the characterization. To achieve the desired satiric ends, More is quite willing to abandon the pretense of verisimilitude which the names of More, Giles, and Morton help to maintain, even to the point of making his good friend and fellow humanist Peter Giles into a rather foolish fellow who is completely taken in by Hythloday's marvelous tale. This credulity of the character Giles enables More to manipulate him as a "straight man" for Hythloday. It is Giles who keeps the discourse moving and who introduces new topics at opportune moments when Hythloday has exhausted a subject or when the reasoning of the fictional More comes too close to exposing Hythloday's fallacious reasoning before he has

fact, the character of Cardinal Morton is almost exactly analogous to Swift's Don Pedro de Mendoza in Book IV of *Gulliver's Travels.* Mendoza is a striking example of the satirist's intellectual norm in action, and he enters at a crucial moment to contradict by his presence the fulminations of the *philosophus gloriosus;* but he is not in and of himself the whole show, nor need he be. The norm in the *Utopia* is explicitly stated once, implied everywhere, and incarnated, at different times, in both Cardinal Morton and the fictional More, most noticeably in the latter at the conclusion of Book II.

told his tale. Although the fictional More is more than a bit gullible, never questioning the reality of Hythloday's voyage, this facet of his characterization does not interfere with the tentative identification of the philosophical position and mental attitude of the fictional More with that of the author More. The same satiric expediency that calls for a characterization of the fictional More as naive in regard to Hythloday's voyage demands at the same time that there be nothing naive about the fictional More's attitude toward Hythloday's ideas and his method of defending them. Indeed, the naif aspect of the fictional More's characterization may be an extension of the character's *eironeia*. For it is by holding back behind the naif facade that the More character disingenuously encourages the *alazon* Hythloday to overextend himself. At any rate, this is certainly the practical result of the fictional More's credulity.

The basic conflict in the *Utopia*, then, is between different sets of mental attitudes. The characters function as mouthpieces for these attitudes, and the characterization is styled to fulfill satiric purposes.

Just as the characterization and the central narrative emphasis are thoroughly Menippean, so too is the structure of the *Utopia*. Structurally, the work falls into two distinct parts. The basic structural principle of Book I is the dialogue, revolving about the introduction of the fictional More to the traveler-philosopher Hythloday and their debate over whether Hythloday could best serve the state by going to court as an advisor. This dialectical structure, according to Northrup Frye, is the most common form of the short Menippean satire.[27] Within the narrative framework of the book the characters, who function as mouthpieces for different sets of mental attitudes, are brought together for an exchange of views through the use of a related Menippean device which Frye calls *cena*.[28] The characters first come together by accident in a street and determine to adjourn to the fictional More's garden, to hear Hythloday's description of his travels. The fictional setting for the entire narrative of Books I and II is the fictional More's garden, which functions as a symposium setting for the ideological conflict between the fictional More and Hythloday. Hythloday's long digressive reminiscence of his trip to England also employs

27 Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, p. 310. Most critics do not consider this possibility, preferring with the editors of the Yale *Utopia* to reflexively derive the dialogue form of Book I from Plato.

28 *Ibid.*

the *cena* convention. The setting for Hythloday's digression is Cardinal Morton's dinner table, a setting which draws a number of new characters into the narrative and provides Hythloday with a philosophical *adversarius* in Cardinal Morton, an object of attack in the stock character of the pedantic lawyer, and opportunity for incidental satire on corrupt and lazy members of the religious order.

Finally, the interest in ideas rather than realistic characters produces something like the logical dislocation remarked of Menippean strategy by Frye. In Book I, Hythloday's sophistical habit of switching back and forth between the real and the imaginary in the course of his discussion is more than sufficient to throw the careless reader into a complete state of confusion as to what is real and what is not. A typical example of this dislocation occurs when Hythloday moves heedlessly from a discussion of conditions in the French court to conditions among an imaginary people called Achorians and then back to the French court again. This same effect of logical dislocation is also achieved in the digressions of Book I, as when, for example, the central focus of the reader's interest, the dialogue between Cardinal Morton and Hythloday, is interrupted for several pages in order to interject a humorous and satirical conversation between a jester and a friar, two peripheral and inconsequential characters.

Finally, such a reading as that proposed here possesses the advantage of recognizing the true literary merit of More's little "golden book." For when considered as Menippean satire, the *Utopia* justifiably may be regarded as a great artistic success similar to the *Encomium Moriae*. Any interpretation of the *Utopia* which views the work as a predominately serious treatise may call it many things but not an artistic success. As a philosophical treatise it must be accounted a failure, for the unified program and the consistent philosophical position which the myriad ideas in the *Utopia* supposedly mirror have yet to be elucidated and systematized after over four hundred and fifty years of intensive study. Only under the rubric of Menippean satire can the *Utopia* legitimately assume the lofty position in the canon of English literature to which its author's artistry and centuries of universal acclaim entitle it.

The Nature of Mark Twain's Attack on Sentimentality in the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*

by James Barlow Lloyd

Mark Twain was not a man to do things by halves; when he wished to make the people of Bricksville, Arkansas, repulsive, they ended up looking much like Yahoos; when he wished to make Col. Grangerford an aristocrat, the old gentleman got starched so badly that one can hardly imagine him sitting down. Thus, if he did not crib a subtitle from Laurence Sterne and call his book *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn: A Sentimental Journey*, he probably just did not think of it, for the sentimentality most emphatically exists, especially in the form of the good old-fashioned cry, which occurs no less than seventy-one times[1] in the novel.

But, since the term sentimentality has become practically meaningless, and since, conceding a definition, its existence in the novel must be of some importance, perhaps some explanations are necessary. According to William E. Lecky's *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, which Mark Twain used extensively,[2] moral man is either "inductive" or "intuitive"; thus, he is governed both by his head (reason) and his heart (feeling).[3] An equal balance between the two will here be considered to result in a right emotional reaction which will be called sentiment as opposed to an imbalance, which will result either in hypocrisy, because of too much head, or sentimentality, because of too much heart. The sentimentalist, then, emphasizes feeling, and quite logically since, as Ernest Bernbaum

[1] Each time that a character is referred to as crying has been considered a separate instance; hence a character may cry three or four times on the same page.

[2] On the relevance of Lecky's ideas to the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* see Walter Blair, *Mark Twain & Huck Finn* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960), pp. 131–44; and on their specific application to sentimentality and crying see Henry Nash Smith, *Mark Twain: The Development of a Writer* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962), pp. 116–18.

[3] William E. Lecky, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, I (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1872), p. 3.

notes, he assumes that human nature is "perfectible by an appeal to the emotions."[4]

Applied to the *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, the above definitions mean that the characters may cry in three different ways: correctly, with the proper balance of intellect and feeling, or hypocritically, with some ulterior intellectual motive, or sentimentally, with too little regard for the intellect. If one then divides the aforementioned seventy-one cries in this way, one may graphically illustrate the importance of sentimentality in the novel by applying the precept of moral perfectibility and measuring the moral states of the characters who cry sentimentally against those who do not. Luckily for the purposes of this study, most of the major characters behave consistently, with only the notable exceptions of Huck and Mary Jane, and either cry correctly—like Huck, Mary Jane and Jim—or hypocritically—like Pap, the Duke, and the King—or sentimentally—like the Judge and his wife, Emmeline Grangerford, the camp meeting crowd, and the Wilks bunch.

In a field dominated by the hypocritical criers, who cry thirty-one times, and the sentimentalists, who cry thirty-six times, Huck, Mary Jane, and Jim are rank amateurs uninitiated in the fine art of crying and woefully out of practice—Jim says, "I doan' skasely ever cry"[5]—whose meager total of eight is almost lost amid the general wail and confusion.[6] Nevertheless, they possess the proper balance of head and heart because, of all the important characters, they alone are shown to cry for such reason and in such manner as most reasonable men might deem justifiable. They may cry, for instance, as Huck and Mary Jane do, over the death of a friend (p. 48) or relative (p. 151), or, as Jim does, over the separation of a family (p. 131), but they will not cry hypocritically, in order to get out of some predicament, or sentimentally, over the death of someone whom they do not know. Yet

[4] Ernest Bernbaum, *The Drama of Sensibility: A Sketch of the History of English Sentimental Comedy and Domestic Tragedy, 1696–1780* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), p. 10.

[5] Mark Twain, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, ed. by Henry Nash Smith (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958), p. 221. All citations will be from this edition and will appear in the text.

[6] The total here—seventy-five—differs slightly from the seventy-one cries cited earlier because occasionally a group of characters will cry together, but in different ways, as when the Duke and King and the Wilks bunch cry over the coffin (p. 138).

Huck and Mary Jane behave inconsistently; he cries in order to make the two boatmen believe his smallpox story (p. 77) and she sometimes indulges in a sentimental cry with the Wilks bunch (p. 138). In other words, Huck follows his head too much and Mary Jane her heart. However, just as he does not seem to belong with the hypocrites, she does not seem to belong with the sentimentalists because, one feels, they have more in common with each other and with Jim than with any of the other characters, as will be shown below.

The problem of the relative moral perfectibility of the members of this or any other group may be approached either by finding evidence of previous improvements or by exploring the character's capacity to be perfected. To find evidence of previous improvements one need only note a character's good qualities and assume that they were produced by some earlier move toward perfectibility. Jim, for instance, proves his loyalty and courage by helping the doctor bind Tom Sawyer's wound and examples could be produced to illustrate Huck's and Mary Jane's courage, but the true relationship between the correct criers goes deeper than the mere citation of abstract qualities. Instead, they are united by the capacity to feel love, and this feeling, and it only, elicits the response which has been classified as a correct cry. Huck cries over Bud (p. 98), Mary Jane over her father (p. 151), and Jim over his family (p. 131), and this capacity to form relationships with other people both sets the correct criers apart from the members of the other groups and establishes a standard for the measurement of the capacity for moral perfectibility.[7]

The members of the hypocritical group—Pap, the Duke, and the King—cry often—thirty-one times—and with an eye toward making a fast buck; they are professionals. Pap cries during his unsuccessful attempt to keep the Judge on his side in the dispute over Huck's money (p. 20), but he is far outstripped by the other two. The King manages to exact over four hundred dollars from the camp meeting crowd with only two cries (p. 112), and when he and the Duke really open up on the Wilks bunch, crying thirteen times altogether, the total runs into the thousands. In fact, when the two first meet on the raft, they have what amounts to a crying contest to establish domi-

[7] That, at least in American literature, the capacity to love equals the capacity for moral improvement should be self-evident. Witness, for instance, the hero of the early seduction novel who repents his follies as soon as he falls in love with the heroine.

nance (pp. 103–5), prompted, one supposes, by the logical assumption that whoever most expertly wields the tools of the trade is most fit to lead.

Naturally, the evidences of previous moral improvements in the members of this group are rare. Pap extorts protection from Huck, while the Duke and the King stoop to robbing the Wilks children. In short, they are about as morally imperfect a lot as one is likely to find; yet, for all that, they still seem harmless enough, probably because although they lack the capacity to love, they lack the capacity to hate as well. That is, they may lie and steal, but they do so not vindictively but disinterestedly, as if it were their duty, their place in the world, to gull the inhabitants of Bricksville. Their position, perhaps, becomes clearer when compared with that of Col. Sherburn who actively hates the Bricksville mob. The King and the Duke, in contrast, do not seem even to dislike anyone, the Bricksville mob included. Governed wholly by their heads, they remain neutral, simply doing their job and moving on with no hard feelings, at least on their side.

If the hypocritical group are professionals, the sentimentalists are talented amateurs who cry because they enjoy crying. What other reason could they possibly have, for, unlike the correct criers, they usually cry over someone whom they do not even know, as the Judge and his wife do when they cry over Pap (p. 20), as Emmeline Grangerford does (posthumously) over Stephen Dowling Bots (pp. 87–88), and as the camp meeting crowd does over the King (p. 112). Occasionally, of course, the object of the sentimental crier's pity is known to him, like Mary Jane's father, but then he, like the Wilks bunch, carries his crying to such lengths as to make himself ridiculous (p. 138). Thus, governed wholly by their hearts, the sentimentalists cry either for what most reasonable men would consider insufficient reason—because they enjoy it—or in what most reasonable men would consider an improper manner—too lustily.

Like the moral character of the hypocritical criers, that of the sentimental criers provides little evidence of perfectibility. In fact, too little information about the moral character of the members of this group exists, aside from the fact that the Wilks bunch turns out to be rather greedy, to make any judgment of them. On the other hand, the sentimental criers are obviously unable to love, since Emmeline Grangerford, to write the kind of poem she does, must feel nothing for Stephen Dowling Bots, and since such others of the group as the

Judge and his wife and the camp meeting crowd, not knowing Pap and the King, may hardly be said to love them. But if, unlike the correct criers, the sentimentalists cannot feel love, then unlike the hypocritical criers they can hate, at least in the opinion of the Duke, who says of the Wilks bunch, "if the excited fools hadn't let go all holts and made that rush to get a look, we'd a slept in our cravats to-night—cravats warranted to wear too—longer than we'd need'em" (p. 173).

Thus, far from being morally the most perfected, the members of the sentimental group are the most morally deranged. Unable to love, yet more dangerous than the hypocritical criers since they are able to hate, they are the objects of a satirical attack which cuts two ways. In the first place, Mark Twain simply uses the hypocritical criers to expose the sentimentalists, to work them up. Pap, for instance, is the tool he uses to get at the Judge, just as he uses the Duke and King to get at the camp meeting crowd and the Wilks bunch. In the second place, the fact that the members of the sentimental group rather than the members of the hypocritical group are the principal objects of the satiric thrusts constitutes an attack in itself. After all, what must the bottom of the scale be like if the Duke and the King are in the middle?

WORKS CITED

Bernbaum, Ernest. *The Drama of Sensibility: A Sketch of the History of English Sentimental Comedy and Domestic Tragedy, 1696–1780.* Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

Lecky, William E. *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne.* Vol. I. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1872.

Twain, Mark. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn.* Edited by Henry Nash Smith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.

Building a Pillar of Fame

by Robert W. Witt

Robert Herrick, of course, relied on the folklore of the seventeenth century, but the extent to which he incorporated the traditional superstitions and customs and the importance of such material in his work have, perhaps, not been fully realized.[1] With Herrick folklore is not always used as mere ornamentation as is the case with many other writers of the period, but it is the basis of a large number of the poems he has written. John L. Kimmey has suggested that Herrick is first of all "a poet fusing classical and Christian motifs to write poetry that will make him eternally famous."[2] This statement may also suggest some reason for his preoccupation with the folklore of his age. What better way to make one's work eternal than to incorporate the ideas which have been preserved among a people in oral tradition for ages, ideas which are thus deeply rooted and will remain, no doubt, part of the very rhythm of life of a people for ages to come. Herrick, furthermore, does not confine himself to the folklore of Dean Prior, as was formerly thought; he incorporates the folklore which was common in all of England during his day, as Mark Reed has demonstrated.[3]

A study, then, of the extent of Herrick's use of folklore and the wide range of superstitions and customs which he covers in his work is perhaps worthwhile, for this range extends from the recording of tidbits such as the age-old superstition that a tingling of the left ear indicates when someone is speaking ill of you, in "On himselfe,"[4] to the full account of the May Day festivities in "Corinna's going a May-

1 The subject has been considered, of course, but the studies are not complete or detailed.

2 "Robert Herrick's Persona," *SP*, 67 (1970), 221.

3 See his article "Herrick Among the Maypoles: Dean Prior and the *Hesperides*," *SEL*, 5 (1965), 133–50.

4 L. C. Martin, ed., *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 329. All quotations from Herrick's poetry will be taken from this edition. Hereafter, page references will be included in the text, in the event of duplicate titles on the same page the number of the poem on the page will also be given.

ing" (p. 67). For convenience the various superstitions and customs can be classified into groups of folklore dealing with (1) birds, insects, and reptiles; (2) animals and fishes; (3) plants; (4) supernatural beings; and (5) holidays.

In seventeenth-century England, as of course in many other ages and many other lands, certain birds were considered to be birds of ill-omen, such as the owl and the raven, while others, such as the dove and the swallow, were considered to be birds of good omen. Herrick alludes to this idea in "An Epithalamie to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Ladie" (p. 53) when he wishes that all "luckie" birds may side with the pair. In several instances he uses the dove as a bird of good omen, as in the last Chorus of "*Connubii Flores*, or the well-wishes at Weddings" (p. 220), where he also ascribes the traditional value to the raven. Birds were, of course, associated with lovers, particularly in the belief that they choose their mates on Valentine's Day, and Herrick records the idea in "To his Valentine, on S. Valentines day" (p. 149), as well as the idea that the direction of the flight of birds is of significance.

The robin was endowed with a great deal of kindness and compassion in the seventeenth century; it would supposedly cover with leaves any dead body that it happened to find.[5] Herrick records this superstition in "To Robin Red-brest" (p. 19), "To the Nightingale, and Robin-Red-brest" (p. 111), and "Upon Mrs. Eliz: Wheeler, under the name of Amarillis" (p. 46). In the latter poem, though, the robin discovers that the body is not dead, only sleeping, and he chirps for joy—an indication of his kindness and compassion.

Herrick records the popular notion that swans sing sweetly just before they die in "His fare-well to Sack" (p. 45), and apparently alludes to it, at least to the idea that swans sing, in two other poems, "To Apollo. A short Hymne" (p. 122) and "The Apparition of his Mistresse calling him to Elizium" (p. 205). In the first of these two poems swans are offered to Apollo if he will inspire the poet to "tune" his words so that they will fall "smoothly musicall. . . ." It would seem that the "singing" swan would be appropriate as an offering. In "The Apparition" he compares Beaumont and Fletcher to swans who sing.

[5] T. F. Thiselton Dyer, *Folk-lore of Shakespeare* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966), p. 143.

The nightingale, according to the popular belief, sang while its breast was impaled upon a thorn. Herrick seems to refer to this idea in "Oberons Feast" (p. 119), where one of the delicacies is "The broke-heart of a Nightingale / Ore-come in musicke . . . ," and in "To the Nightingale, and Robin-Red-brest" (p. 111) in which he refers to it as "Thou pittifull, and pretty *Philomel*. . . ."

Cock crow was, of course, the signal of the approach of dawn and thus the signal that all spirits from another world must depart. Herrick uses the traditional idea in "The Apparition of his Mistresse calling him to Elizium" (p. 205), where he refers to the cock as "Bellman of the night," and in "The Old Wives Prayer" (p. 177).

The kite was considered an unlucky bird, and the name came to be used as a term of reproach because of the ignoble habits of the bird. The comparison of our griefs to kites in "Crosses" (p. 278) is appropriate. The most ominous and unlucky bird, though, was the owl, and Herrick appropriately refers to this bird in "An Epithalamie to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Ladie" (p. 53) as the "Fatal Owle. . . ."

The well-known legend of the phoenix was popular in the seventeenth century, and Herrick makes several references to it throughout his poetry. He records the ability of the phoenix to regenerate itself in "An Ode to Master Endymion Porter, upon his Brothers death" (p. 72) and in "Another New-yeeres Gift, or Song for the Circumcision" (p. 366), and he emphasizes the idea that there is only one phoenix when he refers to it in "The Invitation" (p. 262) as the "bastard *Phenix*. . . ." He also refers to the sweet odor of its nest in "Love perfumes all parts" (p. 59) and in "A Nuptiall Song, or Epithalamie, on Sir Clipseby Crew and his Lady" (p. 112).

Herrick does not record much of the folklore concerning the insects and reptiles, but he does incorporate a few of the traditional ideas. The presence of crickets in a house was thought to be a good omen and a prognostication of cheerfulness and plenty. Herrick uses this idea in "A Country life: To his Brother, M. Tho: Herrick" (p. 34), "To Larr" (p. 131), and "Oberons Feast" (p. 119). He also uses some of the superstitions concerning the toad. According to popular belief, the toad was highly venomous and thus had preternatural powers. Herrick alludes to this idea when he uses the toad as the principal ingredient in "A charme, or an allay for Love" (p. 209).

The animal kingdom has been the subject of much superstitious belief, and again Herrick has recorded many of these ideas. Some ani-

mals, as some birds, have been traditionally regarded as ominous. The cat, for instance, has been an animal of ill omen because of its association with witches. Herrick appropriately has a "brace" of cats to attend the witch in "The Hag" (p. 333). There is also a goat in the presence of the witch in this poem, and it, too, is appropriate because the goat was associated with evil spirits, particularly the devil.

Most of the superstitions surrounding horses concerned what happened to them rather than what they did. The fairies and witches, according to popular belief, molested them and often entangled their hair into many knots. Witches would also take a horse and ride it all night, leaving it to be found the next morning bathed in sweat. Herrick records both of these superstitions in "Another Charme for Stables" (p. 284). A common name for a horse during the time was "Cut," which was given either from the horse's being docked or gelded, and it was occasionally applied to a man as a term of contempt. Herrick names the character appropriately in the epigram "Upon Cuts" (p. 144).

The lion and the squirrel were two animals in particular which were regarded in a favorable way. Even though the lion has always been considered ferocious, it was at the time thought to be a generous animal. Supposedly it would not injure a royal prince, and it would always be gentle to those who prostrated themselves before it. Herrick uses this idea to admonish the lady in "To Electra. Love looks for Love" (p. 252).

Herrick was apparently not much interested in the fishlore of his day, for there is very little of it recorded in his work. He, though, perhaps alludes to a popular idea about the pike, or luce, which was considered a tyrant fish, one that preyed on other fish and attacked any other creatures that might venture into its domain.[6] In this context the following statement in Herrick's "His Cavalier" (p. 30) takes on new significance:

> This, this a virtuous man can doe,
> Saile against Rocks, and split them too;
> I! and a world of Pikes passe through.

6 See the interesting story recorded by Issac Walton in *The Compleat Angler*, Everyman Edition (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1965), p. 121.

As the statement about the pikes occurs in conjunction with sailing, it may be that Herrick had in mind the image of a man passing through, or swimming through, a school of the supposedly ferocious tyrant fish.

Herrick's poetry abounds with references to plant life, especially various flowers; and given his interest in folklore, naturally he would be interested in preserving the folk tales and superstitions associated with the plants. He also demonstrates some practical knowledge about the agriculture methods of the day. He states, for example, in "Cruelty" (p. 292) that "some plants prosper best by cuts and blowes . . . ," and in "Rest Refreshes" (p. 292) he explains the necessity of allowing land to lie fallow occasionally: "a resting field / Will, after ease, a richer harvest yield. . . ."

Different plants, in one way or another, were associated with various occasions. A favorite custom on festive occasions was to roast a wild apple, or crab, before the fire and then put it into ale. Herrick mentions this practice in "His age, dedicated to his peculiar friend, M. John Wickes, under the name of Posthumus" (p. 132). All in all, the beverage consisted of ale, nutmeg, sugar, toast, and the roasted crabs; it was referred to as "Lambs-wool," and it formed the ingredient of the wassail bowl. Herrick records the recipe for it in "Twelfe night, or King and Queene" (p. 317).

Ivy, because of its association with Bacchus, had become recognized as the symbol for a tavern or alehouse and hence in general associated with revelling and festive occasions. In "A Christmas Caroll, sung to the King in the Presence at White-Hall" (p. 364), Herrick presents an "Ivie Wreath" to the "Lord of all this Revelling." He also bequeaths Him holly, which is also, of course, appropriate for the Christmas season.

Both the laurel and the palm were traditionally used to symbolize victory, and the olive branch peace. In this connection Herrick refers to crowns made of laurel in several instances. Palm was not used in crowns, but it was carried before the conquerors in triumphal processions. Herrick illustrates this practice in "To The King, upon his taking of Leicester" (p. 271), and in "The Olive Branch" (p. 73) he bases the poem on the traditional symbol.

Balm was associated with curatives, and Herrick uses it in this context in several poems. In "Upon Love" (p. 274, No. 5) it is used as a comparison for Julia's kiss, which would cure his wound. In a differ-

ent context but with the same meaning it is used in "Upon the Bishop of Lincolne's Imprisonment" (p. 52). Perhaps the most popular usage was with a religious connotation, and Herrick uses it this way numerous times, as in "To Christ" (p. 377).

The rose was also popularly associated with both religion and romantic love. Herrick gives it the traditional significance in a religious context in "To his Saviour, a Child; a Present, by a child" (p. 354). He also explains how the rose came to have a thorn in "The Rose" (p. 396).

In the context of romantic love the rose was used as a symbol for love itself and for the beauty of the beloved. For a poet to compare his lady to a rose was a flattering tribute because the rose held the most honored position among the flowers. Herrick explains in "The Parliament of Roses to Julia" (p. 8) that all of the flowers formed a parliament and "Voted the Rose; the Queen of flowers." And in "The Funerall Rites of the Rose" (p. 237) all of the other flowers come to mourn and keep a "solemn Fast. . . ." He also appropriately offers roses to Venus in "A Vow to Venus" (p. 313). The rose could, furthermore, be used in a certain love divination. A lady was supposed to pick a rose on Midsummer's Eve and keep it in a clean sheet of paper until Christmas Day; if the rose was as fresh then as when it was first picked, she was to wear it in her bosom to church, where the man whom she was to marry would come and pluck it out.[7] Herrick obviously refers to some such practice in "An Epithalamie to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Ladie" (p. 53):

> Then grieve her not, with saying
> She must no more a Maying:
> Or by Rose-buds devine,
> Who'l be her Valentine.

Several of the plants were particularly associated with death or with funerals. The bay, for example, was used at funerals. It served as an emblem of the resurrection, probably because it revives from a seemingly dead state. That it is associated with resurrection and hence immortality is perhaps what Herrick has in mind in several passages when he indicates that the praise of others will be his crown

[7] Edwin and Mona Radford, *Encyclopaedia of Superstitions* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), p. 205.

of bays, as in "To the right Honourable Edward Earle of Dorset" (p. 187), "To his honoured and most Ingenious friend Mr. Charles Cotton" (p. 297), and "An Hymne to the Muses" (p. 261).

The cypress and the yew were, of course, associated with funerals and with churchyards. Herrick follows the tradition by having the lady in "To Perenna, a Mistresse" (p. 89) place a sprig of cypress on his tomb. Also, in "His age, dedicated to his peculiar friend, Mr. John Wickes, under the name of Posthumus" (p. 132) he writes:

> The pleasing wife, the house, the ground
> Must all be left, no one plant found
> To follow thee,
> Save only the *Curst-Cipresse* tree.

The yew was so often planted in graveyards that it came to be referred to as the dismal yew. Herrick records the traditional idea about both trees in "To the Yew and Cypresse to grace his Funerall" (p. 111).

The primrose was also a symbol of sadness and death, and Herrick uses it as such in "The Primrose" (p. 208), "To Primroses fill'd with morning-dew" (p. 104), and "To Perilla" (p. 9). The violet was sometimes a symbol of early death; Herrick follows this tradition in several instances, for example in "A Meditation for his Mistresse" (p. 87) and in "Upon Prew his maid" (p. 262). Daffodils could represent short life because of their own brief existence, and Herrick makes them the basis for a reflection on man's "short time to stay" in "To Daffadills" (p. 125) and "Divination by a Daffadill" (p. 38).

The rue and the willow were not necessarily representative of death, but they were both used as signs of sorrow and sadness. Rue was popularly known as Herb Grace because the word *rue* means to regret or be sorry and was, therefore, associated with repentance, the chief sign of grace. Herrick makes it symbolical of regret in "The admonition" (p. 130), when he explains that the diamonds worn by the lady are actually the tears of wooers sent in rue. It was the custom for those saddened by a forsaken love to wear a willow garland.[8] Herrick makes this custom the subject of his poem "To the Willow-tree" (p. 106). The willow, though, was associated with grief and despair in general, not just that of the forsaken lovers. Herrick uses it

8 Thiselton Dyer, pp. 210, 232.

as such in several instances, and he takes the familiar image from the Psalms (137) of the harp hung upon the willow tree to express grief. This image appears in "To his Friend, on the untuneable Times" (p. 84), "To God, on his sicknesse" (p. 361), and "The Widdowes teares: or, Dirge of Dorcas" (p. 373).

Some of the most interesting folklore about the plants has to do with explanations of how they attained their names or colors. Herrick records several of these legends, and in this area he is more inventive than usual. He explains "Why Flowers change colour" (p. 15), "How Primroses came green" (p. 64), "How Marigolds came yellow" (p. 187), "How Pansies or Hearts-ease came first" (p. 152), and "How the Wall-flower came first, and why so called" (p. 14).

One legend which explained the reason for the red rose held that Aphrodite in pursuit of Adonis trod on a white rose bush; her feet were pierced by the thorns, and her blood dyed the white petals red.[9] Herrick's version of the legend, though, as he writes in "How Roses came red" (p. 241), is somewhat different:

> 'Tis said, as *Cupid* danc't among
> The *Gods*, he down the Nectar flung;
> Which, on the white *Rose* being shed,
> Made it for ever after red.

This version is, of course, somewhat similar to the original legend, but in another poem with the same title (p. 105) he offers a completely different explanation. He says that roses were at first white, but they disagreed as to whether they were whiter than his Sapho's breast. After they were "vanquisht quite," they blushed for shame and thus became red.

Herrick offers an explanation for the colors of both lilies and violets, also. The legend in "How Lillies came white" (p. 74) is similar to that in his first version about the rose and thus bears some resemblance to the original legend about the rose:

> *Cupid* and his Mother lay
> In a cloud; while both did play,
> He with his pretty finger prest
> The rubie niplet of her breast;
> Out of the which, the creame of light,

[9] Radford, p. 205.

Like to a Dew,
Fell downe on you,
And made ye white.

His legend about the violet, however, resembles the second version of his rose legend. In "How Violets came blew" (p. 105) he says that Venus and the violets argued about who had the sweetest scent; when Venus lost the argument, she beat the violets and "Her blowes did make ye blew."

Witches, devils, ghosts, and fairies were naturally responsible for a great many of the superstitions prevalent in the seventeenth century, and Herrick records many of the ideas concerning them.

According to popular opinion, witches were old women who were "lame, bleare-eied, pale, fowle, and full of wrinckles. . . ."[10] Herrick creates such an impression of the witch in his "The Hagg" (p. 333) although he does not describe her in detail. Both the witch in this poem and the one pictured in "The Hag" (p. 225) are riding through the skies at night on a staff, and the witch in "The Hag" is in company with the devil. This picture is also in keeping with tradition. Witches supposedly met with the devil and performed various obscene rites in order to make a pact with him. Furthermore, when the devil summoned them to meet in an assembly, if any were lame he "delivereth them a staffe, to conveie them thither invisiblie through the aire. . . ."[11]

Witches, of course, possessed extraordinary powers; they were supposedly able, among other things, to raise storms and winds, pull the moon out of the skies, and bring souls out of their graves.[12] In "The Hag" (p. 225) Herrick says that now the witch is abroad "The storme will arise, / And trouble the skies;" and later "The ghost from the Tomb / Affrighted shall come. . . ." In "The Hagg" (p. 333) the witch is attended by a brace of cats

Who scratch at the Moone,
And threaten at noone
Of night from Heaven for to rend her.

10 Reginald Scot, *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1971), p. 7.
11 Scot, p. 43.
12 Scot, pp. 10, 226–227.

Killing or afflicting the cattle of their enemies was one of the abilities that the witches took special delight in. Herrick records this superstition in "Upon an old Woman" (p. 266).

Because the belief in witchcraft was so widespread, the people of the time devised many charms which would supposedly protect them from the power of witches.[13] Herrick was apparently much interested in these charms, for he records a number of them. Perhaps, as Roger B. Rollin suggests, for Herrick "poetry itself is a kind of charm or 'incantation. . . .' "[14] At any rate, he preserved several of the folk charms current in his day.

It was believed that a knife placed under the window sill would keep witches away. Herrick obviously had this superstition in mind when he explained in "Another" (p. 284) that a knife will keep a sleeping child from harm. When one was kneading the dough for baking, he was supposed to cut a cross on the top of it with a knife in order to avert the power of the witch.[15] Herrick makes this superstition the subject of his poem "Charmes" (p. 322). Not only a knife but anything made of iron—particularly a horseshoe—was supposed to drive away witches. In "Another Charme for Stables" (p. 284) Herrick advises to "Hang up Hooks, and Sheers to scare / Hence the Hag. . . ."

Items associated with the church, of course, were thought to be effective charms against witches and other evil spirits. Even the consecrated bread apparently was used in such a way.[16] Herrick indicates in "Charmes" (p. 284) that it will keep the witch away from a sleeping child if it is placed underneath his head, and in "Another" (p. 323) that a piece of it carried in one's pocket "Charmes the danger, and the dread." Both the bread and the holy water were used as charms for protection from witches. In "The Spell" (p. 258) Herrick lists an interesting mixture:

> Holy Water come and bring;
> Cast in Salt, for seasoning:
> Set the brush for sprinkling:
> Sacred Spittle bring ye hither;

13 See the discussion in Scot, pp. 266–286.

14 *Robert Herrick,* Twayne's English Authors Series, ed. Sylvia Bowman (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966), p. 138.

15 Radford, pp. 158, 261.

16 Scot, p. 282.

Meale and it now mix together;
And a little Oyle to either....

He also includes in the poem two other well-known means of frightening witches:

Give the Tapers here their light,
Ring the *Saints-Bell*, to affright
Far from hence the evill Sp'rite.

Urine was another item believed to be important in different ways as a charm.[17] Herrick uses it as a principal ingredient in "Another to bring in the Witch" (p. 284).

Several charms were used for the threshold which would supposedly keep witches from entering a house. One means was to place a cross of white thorn above the door.[18] This superstition may be the basis for decorating "Each Porch, each doore" with white thorn in "Corinna's going a Maying" (p. 67). Herrick records another charm for the threshold in "An Epithalamie to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Ladie" (p. 53), where he advises the couple to anoint the posts as a charm "Strong against future harme...."

Witches and the devil were closely associated, as noted earlier, and superstitions regarding the devil and all of the various demons were also prevalent. The *Incubi* were one such class of demons, and their primary purpose was supposedly to cause people to commit unlawful sexual acts.[19] In "The parting Verse, or charge to his supposed Wife when he travelled" (p. 174) Herrick indicates that he realizes that his "wife" has the fortitude to say no and thus to resist "Those thy Lust-burning *Incubi*."

Many charms were used to ward off the devil; many of the same charms for the witch would supposedly work as well for the devil or any evil spirit. Holy water and the cross were two principal items used to dispell any malevolent influence. Herrick mentions holy water as a safeguard against "The Fiend" in "To Julia" (p. 324), and the cross in "The Old Wives Prayer" (p. 177) and "On himselfe" (p. 123). He also records two other interesting charms for warding off the devil.

17 Scot, pp. 269, 272.
18 Radford, p. 67.
19 Scot, pp. 85–86.

One of them involves water but not holy water; he writes in "Another" (p. 322):

> In the morning when ye rise
> Wash your hands, and cleanse your eyes.
> Next be sure ye have a care,
> To disperse the water farre.
> For as farre as that doth light,
> So farre keepes the evill Spright.

It was the custom to take the unburned portion of the yule log and lay it up until the next Christmas season, when it was used to ignite the new log. In "Ceremonies for Candlemasse day" (p. 285, No. 2) Herrick explains that the place where this portion of the log is kept will be safe from "The Fiend."[20]

Lighted candles were supposed to help keep away devils and evil spirits. This superstition led to the practice of lighting a candle at a wedding in order to bring good luck to the couple, and at the birth of a child for the same reason. Herrick alludes to both of these customs in "An Epithalamie to Sir Thomas Southwell and his Ladie" (p. 53). It was believed, furthermore, that a candle should be lighted at a death so that the devil could not seize the soul of the dead person.[21] This custom is recorded in Herrick's "The New Charon, Upon the death of Henry Lord Hastings" (p. 416).

Perhaps one of the most common superstitions concerning candles was that they would grow dim or burn with a blue flame if a ghost were near. Herrick refers to this idea in "His Letanie, to the Holy Spirit" (p. 347), in "To Anthea" (p. 20), and in "To his lovely Mistresses" (p. 222).

Ghosts, unlike witches and devils, were supposedly not able to assume any form they might choose but had to appear in the form by which they were known in the material state. In describing himself as a ghost in "To his lovely Mistresses" (p. 222), Herrick implies that he will appear much the same as he does in life except that he will be pale. Whenever ghosts did leave their tombs and walk about on earth, they were supposed to have a particular reason for doing so,

20 Keeping the Christmas log was believed to be, at least, a safeguard to the house against fire—Robert Chambers, ed., *The Book of Days* (London: W. & R. Chambers, Ltd., 1864), II, 735.

21 Radford, p. 57.

such as receiving proper burial for their bodies, seeking revenge on murders, doing penance for their own crimes, and so on. In "To Sir John Berkley, Governour of Exeter" (p. 251) Herrick alludes to the idea of ghosts roaming the earth because of their past crimes. He also indicates in several poems that the proper offerings must be made to appease the spirits to keep them from walking abroad: "To the reverend shade of his religious Father" (p. 27), "To Perilla" (p. 9), and "Upon an old man a Residenciarie" (p. 226). Ghosts, though, could walk abroad only at night and had to return to the spirit world at dawn, as noted earlier. Herrick, of course, records this idea in "The Apparition of his Mistresse calling him to Elizium" (p. 205).

The "spectre huntsman" was a ghost-like figure who supposedly appeared at night, though invisible, and rode through the air followed by yelping hounds. His ominous presence was thought to be indicative of some disaster in the near future.[22] Herrick apparently knew of this superstition, but in "The Hagg" (p. 333) he makes the figure a witch, a huntress rather than a huntsman:

> A hunting she goes;
> A crackt horne she blowes;
> At which the hounds fall a bounding;
> While th' Moone in her sphere
> Peepes trembling for feare,
> And night's afraid of the sounding.

The fairies were supernatural beings around whom considerable folklore had gathered in the seventeenth century. Herrick includes several fairy poems in his collection, and he incorporates a great deal of the traditional ideas about them.[23] To begin with, he consistently assigns the fairy King and Queen the traditional names—Oberon and Mab. He deals with the fairies in five poems in the collection—"The Fairie Temple: or, Oberons Chappell" (p. 90), "Oberons Feast" (p. 119), "Oberons Palace" (p. 165), "The Fairies" (p. 201), and "The Beggar to Mab, the Fairie Queene" (p. 223)—and in all of these, with the exception of "The Fairies," he in every detail emphasizes the diminutive size of the creatures, referring to them as elves in several instances. According to superstitious belief, the fairies were rather re-

22 Thiselton Dyer, pp. 46–47.

23 See the discussion of this point in Daniel H. Woodward, "Herrick's Oberon Poems," *JEGP*, 64 (1965), 270–284.

ligious creatures; Herrick indicates as much in "The Fairie Temple." They were also supposedly fond of elaborate banquets and great lovers of music. In "Oberons Feast" the banquet seems indeed elaborate although Herrick says that it is "lesse great then nice . . . ," and in "The Beggar to Mab" the speaker implies that Mab has a rich store of provisions. Music is an important part of the banquet in "Oberons Feast": "But all this while his eye is serv'd, / We must not thinke his eare was sterv'd . . . ," and there is "many a dapper *Chorister*" in "The Fairie Temple." Also, music is provided in "Oberons Palace." The fairies were supposed to seek romantic settings for their haunts; "Oberons Palace" is a cave which is reached by going through a grove "Tinseld with Twilight," and over a moss-covered bank "Spungie and swelling, and farre more / Soft then the finest Lemester Ore." Both "Oberons Palace" and "The Fairie Temple" are provided with exotic furnishings. The fairies were usually represented as great lovers, as Herrick portrays Oberon in "Oberons Palace." The fairies were also thought to be advocates of cleanliness and neatness. In "The Fairie Temple" Herrick states that "They have their *Ash-pans,* & their *Brooms* / To purge the Chappel and the rooms. . . ." In fact, the fairies would supposedly pinch people black and blue if they were not clean and neat in their housekeeping. Herrick records the superstition in full in "The Fairies."[24]

The customs associated with the various holidays and local gatherings as well as the sports and games with which the people entertained themselves are also very much a part of the folklore of the period. Herrick displays considerable interest in these customs and records many of them in his poetry. Thus he presents a well-rounded picture of the lives of the people in seventeenth-century England.

Christmas was the season of the year which warranted the most celebration and one of the seasons about which many folk customs had become traditional. The Christmas festivities began with the bringing in of the yule log and, as noted, lighting it with the log from the previous year. The log was brought in amid a great deal of celebration; Herrick indicates as much in "Ceremonies for Christmasse" (p. 263), where he records the custom, as well as in "The Ceremonies for Candlemasse day" (p. 285, No. 2).

24 Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), pp. 606–614.

Cakes were made in honor of saints' days and holidays, and during this period puddings came to be the most appropriate for the Christmas season. A variety of plum porridge and mince pies were two of the favorites.[25] Herrick refers to the "Christmas pie" on several occasions, and in "Ceremonies for Christmasse" (p. 263) he refers explicitly to the mince pie and plum porridge. In "Christmasse-Eve, another Ceremonie" (p. 263) he indicates that the Christmas pie is an important part of the festivities.

Christmas carols were then, as now, very much a part of the celebration of Christmas. Herrick has recorded this tradition by including in his collection several carols of his own composition, for example "A Christmas Caroll, sung to the King in the Presence at White-Hall" (p. 364) and "The Star-Song: A Caroll to the King; sung at White-Hall" (p. 367).

The Christmas festivities lasted for twelve days, as Herrick mentions in "A New-yeares gift sent to Sir Simeon Steward" (p. 126), and the twelfth day was a time of renewed celebration. One of the most notable customs connected with this day was the choosing of a "Twelfth-Tide" King and Queen to reign over the merry-making. A large plum cake was made with a bean and a pea in it; whoever got the slice with the bean was King, and whoever the slice with the pea was Queen.[26] Herrick refers to this custom in "A New-yeares gift sent to Sir Simeon Steward," and he records the full ceremony in "Twelfe night, or King and Queene" (p. 317).

Herrick refers also to another custom of the season in "Twelfe night"—the wassail, the traditional drink of the Christmas season. Young women would carry the wassail bowl from door to door presenting the inhabitants with a drink and a song of good cheer; they were suposed to receive a small reward in return.[27] Herrick has preserved this custom in "The Wassaile" (p. 178), which is in the form of verses that might have been sung by the young women on such an occasion. In stanza six of the poem Herrick alludes to another custom which was usually performed on the eve of Twelfth Day: "Then may your Plants be prest with Fruit. . . ." This statement by the wassailers

25 Christina Hole, *English Custom and Usage* (London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1941), p. 20.

26 Hole, p. 30.

27 Joseph Strutt, *The Sports and Pastimes of the People of England* (London: Methuen and Co., 1903), p. 286.

apparently refers to the practice of going into the orchards, chanting a verse, and then pouring some of the contents of the wassail bowl on the trees, particularly apple trees.[28] Herrick more specifically records this custom in "Another" (p. 264):[29] "Wassaile the trees, that they may beare / You many a Plum, and many a Peare. . . ."

St. Distaff's Day was the next day after Twelfth Day and was so-called because the women were supposed to resume the distaff. It seems, however, that no one worked with very much enthusiasm on this day, preferring rather to combine a small amount of work with a large amount of revelling and merry-making. When the women did begin work, the men, who had worked for only a short time in the fields, "made it their sport to set the flax a-burning; in requital of which prank, the maids soused the men from water-pails."[30] Herrick describes just such activities in "Saint Distaffs day, or the morror after Twelth day" (p. 315).

Even though the Christmas revellings supposedly end with Twelfth Night, the ecclesiastical Christmas season extends until Candlemas (February 2), at which time all of the Christmas decorations were by order removed from the churches. All decorations should also be removed from the houses by this time, and it was thought to bring bad luck if they were not.[31] Herrick instructs that all decorations be removed in all of his Candlemas poems (pp. 285, 304), and in "Ceremony upon Candlemas Eve" (p. 304) he alludes to the superstition that decorations hanging after this time will bring bad luck.

May Day was a popular festival. The custom on this day was for people to rise shortly after midnight and go into some wooded area to gather branches and flowers with which they decorated the doors and windows of the houses, all of this being done amid a great deal of merry-making. The girls would collect dew and put it on their faces as a beauty charm.[32] Herrick has, of course, illustrated the tra-

28 Radford, p. 75.

29 This is one of the few instances in which Herrick records a custom peculiar to Devonshire. The practice was common throughout England on the eve of Twelfth Day, but in certain parts of Devonshire it occurred on Christmas Eve. By placing this poem in a series of "Ceremonies for Christmas Eve," Herrick seems to indicate that this was a custom for that day rather than Twelfth Day Eve. See Read, p. 140.

30 Chambers, I, 68.

31 Hole, p. 16.

32 Hole, p. 69.

ditional customs of this day in "Corinna's going a Maying" (p. 67). The May Pole was also part of the celebration; it was set up and decorated, and then people danced around it. Herrick records this part of the festival in "The May-pole" (p. 239).

Whitsuntide, the religious festival to commemorate the descent of the Holy Ghost, was also a time of celebration. Herrick refers to it in "Ceremonies for Candlemasse Eve" (p. 285), and in "The Country life, to the honoured M. End. Porter, Groome of the Bed-Chamber to his Maj." (p. 229) he refers to the "whitsum-ale," a special ale prepared for the occasion which would be sold by the Churchwardens in an effort to raise funds for church repairs.[33]

Several festivals or celebrations were not, so to speak, national holidays but were observed in local areas at the appropriate time. The Church Wake, the anniversary of the dedication of the church, was one such occasion. Herrick describes one of these festivals in "The Wake" (p. 255). It is a time of feasting and celebration, and there are "Morris-dancers" as a part of the entertainment. The Morris Dance was a popular entertainment of the time which was used on many occasions of festivity.

The Lord Mayor's Day was the day after the new Lord Mayor had taken his oath. In the seventeenth century it was a time of considerable festivity. It consisted of the Lord Mayor's Show and an elaborate procession through the town, which would attract large crowds of people. Herrick refers to the occasion and indicates the presence of a large crowd in "Way in a crowd" (p. 200).

Harvest Home was the celebration held at the time of harvest. The last load of grain to be brought in from the fields was decorated with flowers, and people danced about the cart which carried it through the streets. The festivities also included a harvest supper during which the servants and their masters ate at the same table and then mingled together freely through the remainder of the evening.[34] Herrick includes all of these aspects of the celebration in his "The Hock-cart, or Harvest home: To the Right Honourable, Mildman, Earle of Westmorland" (p. 101).

Sheep shearing, even, was a time for celebration among the rural people. A feast was held before the work began during which there

33 Thiselton Dyer, p. 293.
34 Strutt, pp. 287–288.

was apparently a great deal of merry-making. Herrick refers to these festivities in "To Phillis to love, and live with him" (p. 192), where he puts it on a par with a wake, and in "A Pastorall upon the birth of Prince Charles, Presented to the King, and Set by Mr. Nic: Laniere" (p. 85).

Weddings naturally were occasions of celebration, and numerous customs were observed at such times. Herrick has utilized some of these customs in his poems about marriage. The exchanging of rings was practiced as part of the betrothal ceremony; a particular ring called a gimmal, or joint, ring was considered most appropriate. Such a ring was made of two or three pieces which could be fastened together to form a design or taken apart and worn separately. Usually the ring was taken apart and each partner was given one piece; and, at times, a piece was given to the witness.[35] In "The Jimmall Ring, or True-love-knot" (p. 173) Herrick indicates that the ring is composed of three parts and that it is exchanged between lovers.

In "A Nuptiall Song, or Epithalamie, on Sir Clipseby Crew and his Lady" (p. 112) Herrick has the bridegroom on his porch to greet the bride; as she approaches, she is showered with roses and sprinkled with wheat, while some of the well-wishers observe that "Blest is the Bride, on whom the Sun doth shine. . . ." As the married couple prepare for bed, the young men and bridesmaids take the garters and laces from them; the bridesmaids undress the bride and then sew her up in a sheet. All of these customs were traditionally practiced by the English and were very much a part of the celebration of the wedding.[36] All of the young men present at the wedding were customarily allowed to kiss the bride as soon as the ceremony was finished. In "The Tythe. To the Bride" (p. 208) Herrick says that even the "Parson" gets to kiss the bride. Torches were also used, as noted earlier, at the wedding celebrations; Herrick refers to the torches which are present at the festivities on numerous occasions.

English people of the seventeenth century entertained themselves with numerous sports and games; some of these were associated with particular holidays, but most were enjoyed any time there was cause for celebration or entertainment. Herrick records several of these pastimes. In "A New-yeares gift sent to Sir Simeon Steward" (p. 126)

35 Thiselton Dyer, p. 326.
36 Reed, p. 144.

he mentions three sports as being part of the Christmas festivities, "Fox-i'th'hole,"[37] "Blind-man-buffe," and "shooe the Mare." Among the other popular games and sports which he records are "Barley Break: or, Last in Hell" (p. 33); "Cherry-pit" (p. 19); "Crosse and Pile" (p. 189); "Draw Gloves" (p. 99); "Laugh and lie downe" (p. 111); "Stool-ball" (p. 238); "The Quintell," or Quintain (p. 306). He also refers to Push Pin in "Love's play at Push-pin" (p. 17); Nine Holes in "Upon Raspe Epig." (p. 154); and Post and Pair in "Upon Tuck, Epigr." (p. 238).

From this survey it should be apparent that folklore is indeed an important consideration in the poetry of Robert Herrick. He has, in fact, covered almost every area of life in the seventeenth century by recording the customs, traditions, and superstitions which had been kept alive from generation to generation; many of which are still alive today. In numerous poems his purpose seems to be an effort to preserve these ideas. Perhaps it is an effort on his part to identify with that which is eternal, at least in a worldly sense, and thus to make his poetry "eternally famous." Herrick is, of course, more than a poet of folklore, but the use of folklore has certainly contributed to the establishment of his "Pillar of Fame."

[37] Apparently no clear explanation of this game exists. Robert Nares states that it is an old Christmas game but offers no description of it—*Glossary* (Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1966), p. 332. The *OED* explains it as merely "a kinde of playe wherein boyes lift up one leg and hop on the other...." Hunt the Fox, which may be the same game, consisted of one boy "being permitted to go to a certain distance from his comrades before they pursue him, their object is to take him if possible before he can return home"—Strutt, p. 301. The other games mentioned in this section are described in Strutt and Thiselton Dyer.

The Censors in the Years of the Calm

by Jackson Taylor, Jr.

For a number of reasons, the reign of Tsar Alexander III is important to the student of the Russian autocracy. An autocratic system works most freely when it is not challenged by outside forces. In such a period, it is possible to study the institutions of a state which is operating as its adherents wish. From such a study, the historian can gain insight into the justification for the monarchy, its strengths and its weaknesses. During the period from 1882 to 1890, Imperial Russia enjoyed a reasonably prolonged era of internal stability.

The decade after 1881 is known as the calm because during that period, the revolutionary movement was almost completely ineffective. The People's Will, which assassinated Alexander II on March 1, 1881, was destroyed by subsequent police raids. The Marxist and Socialist Revolutionary movements, which were active in the two and one half decades before 1917, had not yet become important forces. Thus, after the autocracy had realized that it had no reason to fear, a realization that was not reached until 1883,[1] it was free to take action unmindful of any conspiritorial opposition.

Alexander III, who came to the throne on March 1, was more dedicated to the absolute maintenance of the autocracy than had been his father. Alexander II had been on the verge of granting a consultative duma at the time of his assassination. Under the influence of the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, Constantin Pobedonostsev, the new tsar suspended that project and replaced its author, Michael T. Loris-Melikov with Count Nicholas P. Ignatev in the Ministry of the

[1] The main reason that the government still feared the revolutionary movement after the arrests in 1881 was the fact that a double agent, Sergei Degaev, submitted false reports making the People's Will seem a more formidable organization than it actually was. See Anna Pribyeleva-Korba, "Sergei Petrovich Degaev i Degaevshchina," *Byeloi*, I, 4 (April 1906), 1–37; S. Valk, "Pobeg Sergeya Degaeva" ("The Escape of Sergei Degaev") *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, XXXI, 1928, pp. 219–222; E.A. Serebryakova, "Vstrecha s Degaevim" ("Meeting with Degaev"), *Byeloi*, XXV (1924), 65–71.

Interior.[2] Ignatev was looked upon as a conservative, but he, in fact, shared many of the views of Russia's liberal Slavophiles. He did not make this apparent at first, but instead, entrenched himself in power for a year before revealing his basic plan, the calling of a *Zemskii sobor*. This totally impractical idea was not discussed with the emperor, but put forth in the public press in May of 1882. Before the end of the month, Ignatev had been replaced by Dmitrii A. Tolstoi, the former Minister of Public Education, a man widely hated by the Russian liberals.[3]

Tolstoi was dedicated to the maintenance of public order. His main purpose during his seven years in office was to maintain an orderly, although modernized, autocracy in which progress could take place. His years are identified with the period of calm, and thus make a convenient period to study tsarist policy in an era of comparative social peace. To those in power, the press seemed to be one of the great dangers to the Russian state. Revolutionaries often created underground presses and used them to disseminate their ideas. Liberals used the legal press to vigorously attack the government. In a state that had just lost a tsar to the revolutionary movement, free expression seemed a privilege too dangerous to be given to those who might agitate for further changes. Thus the tradition of press censorship was not only upheld, but expanded in the years in which the Russian government was not threatened by a major domestic revolutionary movement.

The idea of free press had never been accepted by the autocracy. Under Nicholas I, the Third Section had run a system of preliminary censorship that had greatly inhibited the growth of the press in Russia. This system had been changed as part of the great reforms in the 1860's. The press law of 1865 had freed the Russian press from preliminary censorship for books of more than ten signature pages (160 or 320 ordinary pages), for periodicals that placed a binder with the state, and for news of the state and academic world. The new press bureau in the Ministry of the Interior was to have its own chief, who

2 Anon., "Perepiska Aleksandra III's gr. Loris-Melikovim" ("Correspondence of Alexander III with Count Loris-Melikov") *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, VIII, Alexander to Loris-Melikov, April 30, 1881, p. 128.

3 Judith Ellen Cohen (now Judith Cohen Zacek), *Count Dmitri Andreevich Tolstoi as Minister of the Interior 1882–1889* (Unpublished Masters Thesis: Columbia University, 195x), pp. 1–7.

could impose a variety of penalties on published works. Among these was the forfeiture of the 5,000, or in some cases 2,500, ruble bond imposed on the periodical. A fine of fifty rubles for each issue or number could be assessed. A warning could be given, and the government had the right to suspend the publication of a paper for six months after three warnings. New journals still had to receive the permission of the Ministry of the Interior before they could begin to publish.[4]

The press law of 1865 was liberal in comparison to laws that had gone before it. In liberal hands, it might have been a real boon to freedom of expression in Russia. But the beginning of the swing to reaction after Dimitrii Karakazov's attempt on Alexander II's life in 1866 brought about a reaction in this field, as well as in others. Within seven years, the press of Russia felt itself to be under a sword of Damocles.[5]

The censors of Russia were capricious. While Marx was able to slip through the web of censorship in 1872, largely on account of his dullness,[6] other writers were being suppressed. Thus an author could never be sure that his paper would not receive a warning or his book a suspension from the censors. The author was thus forced to resort to Aesopian language that made his meaning clear to the reader, while the censor could prove nothing wrong in the writing.

The dictatorship of the heart under Loris-Melikov brought about a general easing of the regulations on the press, but the authors of the era still had to make use of the metaphor to protect themselves.[7] With the death of Alexander II and the coming to power by Ignatev, the censorship bureau abandoned its limited moderation and again turned toward repression. Ignatev suppressed thirteen periodicals in his one year in power. Twenty-eight others were given warnings or forced to face some other kind of penalty.[8] This attack on the press

4 Russia: Committee of Ministers, *Spravka o glavneishikh uzakoneniyakh o tsenzure i pechati (Information Concerning the Chief Laws about Censorship and the Press)* (St. Petersburg: n. p., 1902), No. 41, 990, April 6, 1865, pp. 6–14.

5 K.K. Arsenev, *Zakonodatelstvo o pechati (Legislation on the Press)* (St. Petersburg, Tipo-Lithografiya F. Vaisberga i P. Gershunina, 1903), p. 101.

6 Jacob Walkin, *The Rise of Democracy in Pre-Revolutionary Russia* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1962), p. 114.

7 Arsenev, *Zakonodatelstvo o pechati*, p. 125.

8 Stepniak (Sergei Milhailovich Kravchinski), *King Stork and King Log*, vol. 1 (London: Downey and Company, 1892), p. 65.

was launched by the minister's Chief of Press Affairs, P. P. Vyazemski, who was brought into his position to carry out a concerted campaign against writings opposed to the government.[9]

Ignatev had been dissatisfied with the existing censorship law and had begun to write a new one. Tolstoi also found the previous laws inadequate. Three months after taking office, on August 27, 1882, he issued his so-called temporary rules on the press. By these rules, editors whose paper appeared as often as once weekly were required to undergo preliminary censorship when their paper was revived after receiving its third warning. Material must be submitted by eleven o'clock on the morning before publication. This meant that no news in a paper undergoing preliminary censorship could be current. In addition, the names of all authors contributing to the journal could be demanded by the ministry.[10]

The policy of repression established by Ignatev was applied with less intensity during Tolstoi's years of power in spite of these stringent rules. Tolstoi's attitude toward free public expression was summed up in a letter to Constantin Pobedonostsev, Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, dated December 12, 1882, in which he said:

> I am preoccupied at this moment by *The Voice*. Read the article of Kochelev. I doubt that the *Russian Courier* has ever published anything similar. This article is simply revolting. The difficulty comes from the fact that all but a few of our papers are nauseating, that it would be better to suppress the sickness of journalism. But is it not better to act without noise, progressively? Far be it from me to take on the defense of *Russian Courier* or of *Russian Thought*. But what troubles me is the knowledge that other periodicals, which are not worth any more, continue to exist. Is this just? In my opinion, the *Russian Gazette* is not worth any more than the *Russian Courier*.[11]

This letter was written in the heat of anger. The style differs greatly from the ponderous bureaucratic wording of most of Tolstoi's other letters. Yet, his statements on the press form a policy that he carried out throughout his ministry. Not only was the liberal press

9 Arsenev, *Zakonodatelstvo o pechati*, p. 116.

10 Russia: Committee of Ministers, *Spravka o glavneishikh uzakoneniyakh o tsenzure i pechati*, No. 1072, August 27, 1882, p. 38.

11 Constantin Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe* (Paris: Payot, 1927), Tolstoi to Pobedonostsev, December 12, 1882, pp. 227–8.

attacked; occasionally even conservative examples of the sickness of journalism, such as Katkov's paper, felt the weight of Tolstoi's censorship bureau.

Shuvalov, one of the minister's best friends, describes Tolstoi as oversensitive to the press. This can, to some extent, be expected from a man who, as Minister of Public Education and especially in his years out of office, had been a chief target of attack for the liberal press.[12] Furthermore, a crisis between Tolstoi and the press had been precipitated in 1882, when it was rumored that Tolstoi in his former position as Chief-Procurator of the Holy Synod had loaned clerical funds to the Skopinski Bank, which had subsequently failed. Rumors of this in the press thoroughly angered the Minister of the Interior.[13]

Yet Tolstoi acted with some moderation toward the press. He was not free from even more reactionary pressure in making specific decisions. A member of the Consultative Committee of the Ministry wrote to Pobedonostsev that Tolstoi was likely to take too soft a line on *The Voice*. He did not feel close enough to Tolstoi to take an initiative on the matter himself, but he asked Pobedonostsev to intervene with the minister to assure the paper's suppression. He added that the paper had a wide circulation, not because it was liked but because its ideas were fashionable and readers, by having it made themselves seem fashionable as well. If the paper were to be suppressed for a prolonged period, the readers would forget about it, and if it did come back on the market, its readership would have fallen off decisively.[14]

It was with ideas like this that Tolstoi had to work. He might well not have used censorship as much as he did had there not been pressure within the government. But given the seemingly dangerous state of the country and the elements which attacked him for leniency, he was forced to take harsh measures. *The Voice* was suspended once and later, when trying to revive itself under the management of one

12 M. K. Pokrovski, *Pisma Pobedonostseva k Aleksandru III*, (*Letters of Pobedonostseva to Alexander III*) (Moscow: Novaya Moskva, 1925), No. 289, January 16, 1882, p. 365.

13 John F. Baddeley, *Russia in the Eighties: Sport and Politics* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1929), p. 179.

14 Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe*, Bogdanovich to Pobedonostsev, February 11, 1883, pp. 289–91.

of its former employees, it was again refused permission to begin printing.[15]

The case of *The Voice* is only one of a number of cases in which the Ministry of the Interior took action against papers and magazines in Russia. It was important because it frightened other liberal journals into refusing to discuss controversial issues. In all, during Tolstoi's term in office, twenty-four warnings were issued by E. M. Feoktistov, Tolstoi's chief of supervision for affairs of the press.[16] In addition, there were a number of suspensions for more or less prolonged. Papers were also prohibited from being sold on the streets or from taking advertisements. In extreme cases, the government resorted finally to suspending a paper or forcing it to submit to preliminary censorship. This process could take many days if a paper were located in the provinces, with the result that the readership would rapidly evaporate. It might be added that most of the warnings came during the early period of Tolstoi's term in office. As time passed, the penalties became less frequent, but were also harsher.[17]

Perhaps the most widely criticized incident in the matter of press censorship was the case of Michael Katkov. Few people were closer to Tolstoi than the publisher of *The Moscow Gazette.* Few editors supported the government more loyally. His relationship with the tsar was so close that a number of radical writers described Katkov, Pobedonostsev and Tolstoi as the evil triumvirate surrounding Alexander.

Yet even Katkov was not immune from the attacks of the censors of the press. The problem came from the fact that Katkov gained, through P. A. Saburov, a functionary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the terms of the alliance that Russia had with Austria and Germany. Katkov printed them, in violation of the Three Emperors League, and thus caused a fury in St. Petersburg, Berlin and Vienna.[18]

Alexander was especially angry at the incident. As a result, he ordered Tolstoi to send a first warning to Katkov. Now, Pobedo-

15 George Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System,* vol. 2 (New York: Century and Company, 1891), p. 487.

16 Arsenev, *Zakonodatelstovo o pechati,* p. 138.

17 Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System,* vol. 2, pp. 285–93.

18 Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe,* Manasein to Pobedonostsev, May 18, 21, 27, 1887; Saburov to Pobedonostsev, May 19, 1887, pp. 467–72.

nostsev intervened. He sent several letters to Alexander pleading for a lighter punishment for his friend. At last the tsar consented; Tolstoi sent Feotistov to see the publisher and to give him verbal warning. At the bottom of his letter of March 12, 1887 summing up the final decision, Alexander added, "I hope that will be sufficient."[19]

The incident was not yet finished, however. The Committee of Ministers took up the issue when they met five days later in what proved to be an animated session. V. K. Plehve, the head of the police, argued that stronger measures should be taken against Katkov for the transgression. A. A. Abaza, the former Minister of Finance, stated that the affair had ruined the German connection which Russia had built up in the past two decades.[20] This view was partially correct. The Three Emperors League, which had been so important in the Bismarckian system, was dropped that year, to be replaced by the Reinsurance Treaty, which remained in effect until after the Iron Chancellor had fallen from power.

One more problem needed to be resolved concerning this case. Saburov, the functionary who had leaked the information, was indicted by the Ministry of Justice for giving out classified information. His case never came to trial. He was able to explain his situation and was returned to his post and to favor.[21]

The real issue in Katkov's case was one that is still not fully resolved in the United States today: the conflict between the government's right to secrecy in sensitive foreign matters and the public's right to know. In recent years Jack Anderson has been attacked for damaging our relationship with India by disclosing too much of America's views on the Pakistani War and Daniel Elsburg has been indicted for releasing the Pentagon Papers, which were still classified. In nineteenth-century Russia, however, the propriety of publishing government papers without permission was not debated. The officials simply assumed that Katkov had done wrong and debated his punishment.

The problems of Katkov are but one example of the troubles that a writer could run into during this era. By far the most common trouble was a story or article that Tolstoi's censors considered detri-

19 *Ibid.*, Alexander to Pobedonostsev, March 12, 1887, p. 410.

20 *Ibid.*, Feoktistov to Pobedonostsev, March 17, 1887, p. 411.

21 *Ibid.*, Manasein to Pobedonostsev, May 18, 21, 27, 1887, Saburov to Pobedonostsev, May 19, 1887, pp. 467–72.

mental to the autocracy. But anything that touched in an unflattering way upon such subjects as the peasantry, the reforms of the government, the Orthodox Church, or the nobility was likely to evoke a warning from the censors. Nor was the periodical press the only media attacked. Books, plays, libraries, even writing paper were limited by the system of censorship. The latter became an issue in January of 1886 when Pobedonostsev asked Tolstoi to study sales of this item in stationery stores. He feared that the revolutionaries were using letterheads with a red rooster as a symbol of their revolutionary sympathy.[22]

The foreign press was also censored as it came into Russia. A large number of foreign papers were prohibited in the country. Not all of these were liberal, some like the London *Standard* being quite conservative. The problem here was that the paper, although an organ of Disraeli, argued from a democratic point of view. Such arguments were not permissible in Russia. Since the *Standard* was banned, the British colony in Russia was forced to read the radical papers smuggled into the country. This argument was placed before Tolstoi when the correspondent of the *Standard* appealed to him in November of 1882. Such an appeal was not without its effect. The *Standard* was taken off the list of disapproved papers.[23]

The position of foreign correspondents was eased in 1883 when large numbers of them came into Russia for the coronation of Alexander III. The coronation of a new tsar, or any autocrat for that matter, was a glorious and expensive show. The Russian government naturally wanted to get all the good publicity that it could. Therefore, these correspondents were welcomed by the state. In all, about sixty foreign correspondents came, with most newspapers bringing men from Eastern Europe as well as using their regular reporters in Russia.[24]

In spite of the friendly reception in 1883, the foreign correspondents represented a problem for a society of closed information, such as Russia. Free from Russian press censorship, they could report true conditions. In addition, they could have a free hand in reporting

22 Pobedonostsev, *K. P. Pobedonostsev i ero korrespondenti*, vol. 2. (*K. P. Pobedonostsev and His Correspondence*), (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatelstvo, 1923) Pobedonostsev to Tolstoi, January 15, 1886, No. 509, p. 555.

23 Baddeley, *Russia in the Eighties: Sport and Politics*, p. 137.

24 *Ibid.*, pp. 161–2.

false rumors. For example, an Austrian journal stated in 1883 that Russia was about to become a constitutional monarchy. This item was then carried by some Russian journals, infuriating Pobedonostsev, who wrote an angry letter to Tolstoi, demanding that something be done about it.[25]

The people who supported the press laws stated that they helped create a free press. The argument was that, because the press knew what it could print, it was free. The only press that was free, however, was the official press.[26] Even here there were occasional problems. In 1886, the editor of the *Police Gazette* was arrested and briefly imprisoned because of a typographical error. He had stated that there was to be a requiem for "Alexander III." Alexander II was meant,[27] but the use of Aesopean language by reporters drove the board of censors to look upon this as a revolutionary plot within the official newspapers themselves.

Perhaps the most damaging thing that Tolstoi did for Russia's literary heritage concerned the censorship of Count Leo Tolstoi's play *The Power of Darkness.* This dull and brooding play was written in 1886 and was scheduled to be played at the Imperial Theater in early 1887. The costumes had already been bought and the actors hired when the head of the theater censorship division raised an objection to the performance.[28]

There are many legends about *The Power of Darkness* which gained currency in the years that followed. One of the most common is that Alexander wanted the play to be performed, but that he was overruled by Tolstoi, Pobedonostsev and Feoktistov and the play was forced to be cancelled.[29] In actuality, Alexander III was one of the chief censors of this work, reading it with disgust, although he did admire the writing.

"What a pity," he wrote, "that an author with the talent of Tolstoi has not found another subject for a drama."[30]

25 Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe,* Pobedonostsev to Tolstoi, November 18, 1883, pp. 265–7.

26 Arsenev, *Zakonodatelstvo o pechati,* p. 147.

27 Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System,* vol. 2, p. 282.

28 Pobedonostsev, *K. P. Pobedonostsev i ero korrespondenti,* vol. 2, Alexander to Pobedonostsev, No. 599, February 19, 1887, p. 643.

29 Stepniak, *King Stork and King Log,* vol. 1, pp. 6–7.

30 Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe,* Alexander to Pobedonostsev, February 19, 1887, p. 409.

Pobedonostsev attacked the play for its realism, which he described as being worse than Zola's. The big objection to the play was its blatant immorality, which was considered contrary to Russian standards. *The Power of Darkness* did not attack the Russian state, but it did degrade the peasants within it. The problem with showing the drama came not from the upper classes who would see it in the Imperial Theater, but instead, from the effect it might have on peasant girls and domestics when played in Little Theaters.[31]

Censorship of so famous an author as Leo Tolstoi was not easy, even in an autocratic state such as Russia, since the attack on such an author would cause criticism in the democratic west. This was, of course, untrue of cases of censorship of the periodical press, whose editors were largely unknown to the reading public outside their own local areas. Criticism of such censorship was usually couched in general terms.

A factor that made the case even more difficult was that the play had already been reviewed in *The Moscow Church Gazette*.[32] Thus, foreign correspondents in Russia would certainly know that the play existed and would understand that the leading Russian author of the generation had been attacked by the state. In addition to that, *New Time*, attacked Feoktistov for his part in the censorship of the work.[33]

In the end, Tolstoi and Alexander agreed to let the play be printed, but not to allow it to appear on the stage. Reading a play would do less to "enflame the passions of peasant girls and domestics" by keeping it out of their hands, since most were illiterate. This kind of censorship, not totally indiscriminate, but inflicted on style as well as on content, hurt Russia's literary heritage. Leo Tolstoi's wife blamed the press offices in St. Petersburg for the failure of her husband to write a third great novel.[34] The Press Office circumscribed the areas of thought for the people of the country. It failed to allow the press its normal function of suggesting areas in which reform could be brought about. Thus, the system of press censorship hindered Russia's development as a modern power.

31 *Ibid.*, Report by Pobedonostsev, pp. 417–21.

32 Anon., *"Tsenzura i L.N. Tolstoi"* ("Censorship and L.N. Tolstoi"), *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, vol. 1, p. 417.

33 Pobiedonostsev, *L'autocratie russe*, Feoktistov to Pobedonostsev, January 5, 1886, p. 380.

34 James Creelman, *On the Great Highway* (Boston: Lathrop Publishing Company, 1901), pp. 151–2.

The censorship office also had a system of banning foreign books, a system that was very erratic. For one thing, the censors did not have a standard set of rules on works which were denied entrance into the country. Therefore, they had no basis upon which to judge whether a work should be prohibited. The *Wealth of Nations* was illegal in Russia. At the same time, Darwin's *The Origin of Species,* a work which at that moment was stirring fiery religious controversy in the West, was legal reading matter for the people. Perhaps the most absurd attack on a book came when a history of France was banned because it contained the word "revolution."[35] Among other works not permitted were writings of Marx, Lassale, Louis Blanc, Huxley, Mill, Zola, and Spencer.[36] The attacks on these books had begun in January 1883, but were only made public in August of that year.

Tolstoi's ministry was not the only one responsible for press censorship. The Holy Synod had the right to censor religious works and used a special committee in St. Petersburg for this purpose. This committee had the job of rooting out works harmful to the Orthodox faith.[37]

In spite of the rigorous censorship, journalism in Russia survived. The Ministry of the Interior congratulates itself in its official history on the fact that there had been a twenty percent rise in the number of journals during the years from 1881 to 1895.[38] Nevertheless, these journals were circumscribed in their topics, and the lack of free expression was one of the more difficult impediments that Russians had to face.

35 Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System,* vol. 1, p. 185.

36 Baddeley, *Russia in the Eighties, Sport and Politics,* p. 206.

37 Russia: Crown, Statutes, *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiskoi-imperii* (*Full Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire*) (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennoi Tipografiya), III, 7, No. 4905, December 21, 1889, p. 509.

38 Ministry of the Interior, *Istoricheskii ocherk* (*Historical Work*) (St. Petersburg: Tipografia Ministerstva Vnutrennik Del, 1902) pp. 214–20.

God, Glory, and Expansion: The English Missionary in East Africa

by James J. Cooke

The role of the Victorian, English-speaking missionary in east Africa has been consistently misunderstood and misinterpreted. Too often the picture of the missionaries was one of middle-aged, slightly balding men and graying spinsters with Bibles in hand, singing militant hymns, and calling on the unconverted to alter their religious life. While certainly these people existed in Africa they did not represent the activist Christian who ventured to an unknown and dangerous continent to spread the Gospel and to aid, in great, direct measure, the course of Great Britain's colonial expansion. It was impossible to separate the man of God from the milieu in which he lived. That society was Victorian and English. Victorian society manifested its humanitarian concerns in many ways, and the civilizing mission in Africa was a manifestation of that state of mind. Some clerics, writers, and statesmen believed that Britain should carry the benefits of European technology and civilization to the newly opened continent. One British historian wrote, "Concern for Africa flowed from some of the most vivid experiences of Victorian religious and political life. . . . The chains had to be struck from the African's neck. He must be converted. He would be civilized."[1] The natives, the missionaries hoped, would become willing subjects of two sovereigns—the King of Heaven and the Queen of England, but often spiritual work was damaged by an overindulgence in annexationist politics by the clerics who were fully committed to English imperial expansion.[2]

While many later Victorian politicians were lukewarm on the issue of African expansion, many zealous churchmen were certainly not. Filled with a zeal to eradicate black slavery, a large number of clerics

1 Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, *Africa and the Victorians: The Climax of Imperialism* (New York: Anchor Books, 1968), p. 27.

2 The overemphasis on colonial politics was especially true of French Catholics. See Sir Harry Johnston, *A History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3rd edition, 1930), p. 246.

in England urged more and more direct action. In 1787, William Wilberforce and a few antislavery colleagues formed an association to pressure the British Parliament into legislating against the African slave trade. This legislation, passed in 1807, did not go so far as Wilberforce wanted, but it did focus attention on Africa. It brought to the front, however, the issue of slavery and the slave trade in Africa which caught the attention of many youthful romantics and idealists within the church. To rid Africa of slavery via the introduction of the "sound doctrines of Christianity" became a strong motivation force in the English missionary effort. A century later George L. Pilkington, a famous British missionary to Uganda, echoed Wilberforce's angry comments about slavery in Africa.[3] Frederick Lugard, a soldier who explored both east and west Africa in the 1890's, wrote that the introduction of the Christian mission into Africa had a profound effect on the struggle to eradicate black slavery. At one point, the missionaries in east Africa who were exasperated at futile attempts to abolish both the lucrative trade and the institution prepared for war against the Arab slavers. The Christians raised a battle flag, Lugard related, emblazoned with the word Freedom, and, in fact, an anti-slavery war raged in east Africa in 1888 and 1889.[4]

The missionaries alone could not stamp out human bondage. The abolition of slavery could only be accomplished by the European powers who had military, diplomatic, and political force. The nations of Europe had the irresistible might to end slavery, if they wished to act in concert; however, in the late nineteenth century each state had its own idea of how to open Africa for expansion and, if practical, for economic exploitation. What had to emerge, by necessity, was an alliance of the missionaries and state with the cleric's ultimate goal being the "civilization and Christianization" of Africa. But not every European state professed the same faith. France was Catholic, as was Belgium and Italy. Great Britain remained on the whole protestant and English missionaries came to Africa from every section of the island. From Uganda, Pilkington wrote to his father

[3] George Pilkington, Diary entry Fere Town, east Africa, June 17, 1890, quoted in Charles Harford-Battersby, *Pilkington of Uganda* (New York: Revell, 1899), pp. 75–76.

[4] Frederick D. Lugard, *The Rise of Our East African Empire: Early Efforts in Nyasaland and Uganda*, I (London: Frank Cass, 1893, new impression, 1968), 222–24.

that African missionary efforts demanded "Cambridge men—Experience has convinced [me] that educated gentlemen are absolutely needed for Africa."[5] Pilkington simply could not separate himself from the society which he knew, be it English and Protestant, French and Catholic.

Here was perhaps the missionaries' greatest challenge: to divorce themselves from the political, social, and economic milieu of Europe. Could they, in fact, serve two masters, and by doing so still remain free of European colonial conflicts in Africa? That they failed to disengage themselves from European conflicts and prejudices was shown by their political efforts in east Africa. The formation of the *wa-Fransa* or French speaking Catholic party and the establishment of the *wa-Inglasa*, or English-speaking Protestant party, in the same area were clear evidences of the missionaries encouraging colonial rivalry.[6] They did so simply because they were human, endowed with emotions and loyalties which they learned in the mother country. The spread of language, learning, national patriotism, culture, and the faith became the goal of every missionary, and only rarely could servants of the church totally subordinate patriotism to the concepts of Christian oneness in a nonbelieving land. Many American missionaries, for example, because of their protestant beliefs and their usage of the English language, bound themselves to British imperial policy as well as to protestant missionary goals. Samuel N. Lapsley from Selma, Alabama, a Presbyterian missionary to the upper Congo, went so far as to wish to convert French and Belgian Roman Catholics to the protestant faith before leaving Europe for Africa.[7] These examples of chauvinism and national prejudices did not mean that Pilkington of Uganda, Lapsley of the upper Congo, or Mckenzie of east Africa were hypocrites or fanatics. They were simply men who lived and interacted with their times, and to see them as more is unfair; less is unjust.

Most of the English-speaking protestant missionaries to east Africa began their service either in Zanzibar, or before 1895, in Madagascar.

[5] Letter from Pilkington to his father, Cambridge, November 3, 1889, as quoted in Harford-Battersby, *Pilkington*, p. 53.

[6] Lugard, *Rise of East African Empire*, II, 64–66.

[7] Letter from Lapsley to a Ladies' Church Group, Brussels, March 24, 1890, quoted in James W. Lapsley (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Samuel N. Lapsley: Missionary to the Congo Valley, 1866–1892* (Richmond: Whittet and Shepperson, 1893), pp. 46–47.

Most Roman Catholic clerics started their service on Madagascar. However, for both the prize was neither of the two islands—it was the vast hinterlands of east Africa. Zanzibar played the larger role in the protestant movement into the hinterlands simply because, unlike Madagascar where French influence was strong, the British, since the Anglo-German convention of 1890, had a preponderance of power on the island. Official French opinion was not especially pleased over British control of Zanzibar,[8] and French-speaking Catholic clerics seemed inclined not to accept the 1890 colonial arrangement.[9] To counter French influence, the British Consul in Zanzibar took stern measures to limit Catholic, non-English activities. Since 1888, the Sultan of Zanzibar, who was by the 1890's under the control of England, gave yearly donations to French missionaries to aid them in their work. Late in 1894 the British representative on Zanzibar pressured the Sultan into ending the contributions which had the effect of slowing down Catholic activities on the island. Also, the British East Africa Company refused to give special rates to the Catholics for goods sent to their missions in the interior of Africa, especially in the hotly contested Uganda region.[10] To make matters worse, British agents on Zanzibar began expelling French missionaries as subversive agents, and these acts caused a good deal of irritation between London and Paris.[11] The French Catholics appeared stronger colonialists than were some of the official representatives of the Paris government, and many British officials and missionaries wrote that the French were more determined to win territory for France than souls for Christ.[12]

8 Arthur H. Hardinge, *A Diplomatist in the East* (London: Jonathan Cape, nd), p. 123. Hardinge was, for many years, the British Resident on the island of Zanzibar.

9 *Ibid.*

10 Note from Baron d'Estournelles de Constant to Hanotaux, French Foreign Minister, Paris, November 21, 1894, as found in France, Ministère des Affaires Etrangers, Archival Volume 899.

11 Ministerial Note from Hanotaux, Paris, February 6, 1895, as found in *Ibid.*, Archival Volume Aden, 1885–1895.

12 Dispatch from Lord Dufferin, British Ambassador to France to Lord Kimberley, Foreign Secretary, Paris, November 27, 1894, as found in Great Britain, Archives of the Foreign Office, Public Records Office Carton 403/222. For an interesting French account see André Lebon, *La Pacification de Madagascar*, (Paris: Plon, 1928). André Lebon was the Minister of Colonies during this period, and was instrumental in annexing Madagascar. Also, James J. Cooke, "Madagascar and Zan-

In the long run, however, the English-speaking missionary delved into the same sort of imperial politics in the areas where he worked, regardless of the political control of the region. William E. Cousins, a member of the London Missionary Society and a missionary to Madagascar, wrote in his *Madagascar of Today* (New York: Revell, 1895) that the Catholic faith was the predominant western religion on Madagascar. The dominant position of the Catholics strengthened by the large numbers of French colonial, administrative officials on the Island. Cousins concluded, "To Englishmen this [French, Catholic victory] may be a disappointment. There are friends of Madagascar who would heartily rejoice in the establishment of a British protectorate. It may be our national vanity that leads us to believe that we could so govern Madagascar as to benefit greatly the people themselves and to aid them in their upward progress; but there are facts as to British influence in other parts of the world that seem to warrant such a belief."[13] Cousins, in his religious and patriotic zeal, stated what was on the minds of many British protestant and French Catholic missionaries—secure territory for the mother country. Cousins, in the conclusion to his book, wrote that the protestant converts on Madagascar would stand firm in the face of great persecution by the French. Implying that the British government would not allow wholesale persecutions of English sympathizers, he prayed for British intervention of some sort.[14]

Political and religious confrontations on Madagascar and Zanzibar were restricted to small, defined territories. Religious conflicts became extremely heated when they passed to the east African mainland where vast tracts of territory were very much in question. From the islands off the coast came missionaries embued with two distinct goals: annex territory for Britain or France and convert the natives to their particular form of Christianity. As it appeared, both desires went hand in hand, but it appeared that often colonial politics came

zibar: A Case Study in African Colonial Friction, 1894–1897," *African Studies Review* XIII, 3 (December, 1970), 435–45.

13 W. E. Cousins, *The Madagascar of Today* (London: Revell Company, 1895), pp. 154–55.

14 Ibid., p. 159. French religious policy was defined by General Joseph Galliéni, a staunch partisan of French imperial expansion. See Maurice Gontard, "La politique religious de Galliéni à Madagascar pendant Les premières années de l'occupation française (1896–1900)," *Revue française d'histoire d'outre-mer* LVIII, 1971, 183–238.

before religious conversion. Uganda was the region where the opposing missionary groups directly confronted each other, and in the early 1890s it seemed likely that Uganda would fall to the power who would simply seize it. The British East Africa Company had commercial interests in the region but was rapidly losing money. There were rumors that the company, because of her financial difficulties, was planning to withdraw from Uganda. The company's administration was economically bolstered by a gift from the Church Missionary Society which for all practical purposes tied the English-speaking protestant missionaries to the fate and future of the commercial company and Uganda. The British clerics were determined not to lose in Uganda what they believed they had lost on Madagascar.[15]

The obstinate determination of the English missionaries to hold Uganda led to a number of thorny problems for the administrators of the East Africa company. Pilkington and his colleagues tended to view any attempt to normalize relations between the Catholics, Protestants, and Muslims as a sign of near treason. Consequently, there was continual bickering and bad relations between the British administrators and the clerics. Pilkington and Lugard reached a point where they continually argued, and finally they decided not to speak to each other. At one point in the spring of 1892, Lugard informed the churchmen that, as a representative of the east African Company, he tried to avoid an overemphasis on politics. Pilkington exploded and told Lugard that the British missionaries did indeed take part in partisan politics, and that they must do so when, ". . . . politics and religion were so intimately connected."[16] To his diary the English explorer confided, "Never in my life had I met so difficult a set of men to deal with. Even my most friendly remarks were twisted and distorted until I found the only way of not falling foul of them was to leave them alone."[17]

Pilkington and his coworkers firmly believed that they had to be almost fanatical in their devotion to the British imperial and reli-

15 Sir George Portal, *The Mission to Uganda* (London: Arnold, 1894), pp. 6–8. Robinson and Gallagher, *Africa and the Victorians*, pp. 307–29.

16 Diary entry April 12, 1892, as found in Margery Perham and Mary Bull (eds.), *The Diaries of Lord Lugard: East Africa, January 1892 to August 1892*, III (Evanston, Ill: Northwestern University Press, 1959), 167–68.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 168.

gious efforts in Uganda because in 1892 and early 1893, they feared that the English presence in Uganda was in danger. Pilkington wrote long letters complaining of Lugard's administration of the British East Africa Company. The missionary believed that Lugard's policies in regards to the three religious sects was not in keeping with company's policy. The cleric wrote, "The [religious] policy has always been rather favorable to the Papist party; most careful had been both Captains Lugard and Williams to let no national or religious prejudice seem in any way to influence them in their administration."[18]

During the later part of April, 1892, Lugard began to receive reports of atrocities in the interior. True to form, the Catholics blamed outrages on the Protestants and the Protestants complained about the Roman Catholics committing criminal acts. The agents of the East Africa Company were indeed hard pressed to deal with the situation, which was rapidly deteriorating into a civil war. When fighting developed in 1892, Lugard tried to make peace. He believed that it would be necessary to separate the factions, if possible. To complicate matters the financial situation of the East Africa Company became more and more serious because of a number of factors, and since the company was financially collapsing, Lugard decided on a policy of ending the fighting and separating the rival factions as quickly and as cheaply as possible. Lugard was convinced of the necessity to maintain peace in order to save the company in Uganda.[19]

Lugard used the force at his command, including Maxim machine-guns, to inflict several defeats upon the *wa-Fransa* forces. Pilkington, after watching the bloody fighting and casualties wrote, ". . . it has been God's doing. You know very well that this [violence and bloodshed] is not the sort of thing we count success, or care for, except in so far as it opens the door for the Gospel. . . . The English flag at last is really hoisted on Mengo."[20] By April 5, 1892, Lugard finished a treaty with the Catholic forces which was, in the British Commissioner's eyes, very moderate. However, no sooner was the treaty signed than the *wa-Inglesa* forces and the British missionaries, especially

[18] Letter from Pilkington to an unnamed correspondent, Uganda, January 31, 1892, as found in Harford-Battersby, *Pilkington*, pp. 169–70.

[19] Lugard, *Rise of the East African Empire*, II, 314.

[20] Letter from Pilkington to an unnamed correspondent, Uganda, April 1, 1892, as found in Harford-Battersby, *Pilkington*, p. 182.

George Pilkington, began to complain bitterly about the agreements.[21] Outrages, committed by both sides, continued in Uganda, and Lugard became extremely disgusted. At one point, he wrote in his private diary that he was utterly ashamed of the actions and the attitudes of the Protestant missionaries.[22]

As Lugard realized, pressure was building in England's missionary circles for a wholesale replacing of the Imperialist East Africa Company with total British control. Certainly, as clerical pressure increased and the East African Company became insolvent, the stage was set for some formal and forceful action in England. In their struggle to maintain Uganda as a British area the missionaries were quite fortunate to have on their side Lord Rosebery, who was known as a militant annexationist. Rosebery, Foreign Secretary in Gladstone's fourth cabinet, was one of the few in that government who favored holding Uganda in the British empire. Under Rosebery's guidance and private orders an official mission was dispatched to the area in 1893 under the command of Captain Gerald Portal.[23] Portal's mission was hampered by the same problems which plagued Frederick Lugard's expedition during the violent days of 1892. The government, except Rosebery, was not overly inclined to support an annexation of Uganda despite the growing requests from protestant missionary groups in England. There were great difficulties in dealing with Muslims and, from Lugard's point of view, most importantly with the Roman Catholic missionaries and their supporters in the *wa-Fransa*. If the experiences on Madagascar and Zanzibar could serve as an example, the British would find the process of pacification to be difficult indeed, and there were many in the Gladstone government who were openly opposed to any African venture. It fell to Rosebery, Portal, and the missionaries to push the Uganda question as quietly as possible.[24]

21 Diary entries for April 11 and 12, 1892, as found in Perham, *The Lugard Diaries*, III, 163–71.

22 Diary entries for April 14 and 15, 1892, as found in *Ibid.*, pp. 174–81. It was during this period that Lugard became totally frustrated with the British missionaries and the *wa-Inglesa* chieftains. Also, during this period the explorer planned an expedition. He was accused by the *wa-Inglesa* chieftains of leaving the protestants in favor of Roman Catholics. On April 10, 1892, Lugard wrote in his diary that he was sick from the whole affair.

23 Portal, *Mission to Uganda*, pp. 6–7.

24 Lugard, *Rise of East African Empire*, II, 549–50. Robinson and Gallagher, *African and the Victorian*, pp. 322–23.

Portal, who had with first-hand knowledge of the political and religious condition in Zanzibar, gathered his staff and marched as Rosebery ordered into the interior of Uganda. In Great Britain the Foreign Secretary was making every effort to insure the eventual success of the mission since Rosebery now viewed Uganda as a personal question. Without fully informing Parliament or the Cabinet of his actions, Rosebery began to rely heavily on the power of religious groups in Britain to pressure for a permanent British colonial administration in Uganda. There was a fear, in England and in Uganda, that the Catholic Party was again preparing to resist violently efforts by the British to replace the now moribund Imperial British East Africa Company with regular English colonial officials. It was rumored that the Catholics were purchasing arms from German sources in the region.[25]

Also of distress not only to Rosebery but to the Protestant missionaries, was the fact that French colonial politicians and the Quai d'Orsay were openly championing the cause of the Catholics in East Africa, particularly in Uganda. In the French Chamber of Deputies, colonialist oriented representatives rallied to the support of the French Roman Catholic Missionaries in Uganda. Ironically, many annexatonists who were openly anti-clerical vocally demanded that the French government, especially the Foreign Ministry, take steps to insure the safety of French clerics. An alliance had been born between the militant expansionists and the missionaries, as was the case in Britain, when it became obvious that both groups had the same expansionist goals in mind.

Gabriel Hanotaux, the chief of the French Foreign Ministry, while not overly fond of the Catholic efforts, threw his support to the missionaries. His powerful ally in the Chamber, Eugène Etienne, deputy from Oran, Algeria, and chief of the imperial activists in the Chamber, echoed Hanotaux's ideas pertaining to support for the efforts of French missionaries in Uganda. Seeing the Uganda question in the contest of a larger colonial question on the whole of east Africa, particularly the Nile,[26] the colonialists in Paris preferred to keep pres-

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 540–53.

26 That the Uganda question was part of the larger Nile question was the opinion of most English and French politicians. Hardinge, *Diplomatist*, p. 123. Also see Alf A. Heggoy, *The African Policies of Gabriel Hanotaux* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1972), p. 65.

sure on England. Etienne went before the Chamber to make an important policy statement on African questions in general. Few could doubt that Hanotaux approved what Etienne would say, and few could question that the address was aimed not only at the Chamber but also at Lord Rosebery, who had become the British Prime Minister on March 4, 1894.

During a very serious debate, Etienne addressed the Chamber on France's colonial policies, with special reference to the situation in east Africa. Attacking Britain for her concept of a Thin Red Line stretching from Cairo to the Cape, Etienne stated that certainly Britain coveted Uganda. However, he argued, for many years France had had Roman Catholic missionaries in the region. Once England discovered this fact, she dispatched protestants to the continent to subvert the work of the Catholics. Despite Rosebery's actions, Etienne argued, French missionaries, especially the ultra-imperialistic White Fathers, would continue to work for the Church and for France.[27] To place the speech in the proper context Etienne ended his defense of the Catholic efforts by saying, "Gentlemen, it is the Egytain question which thusly opens before you."[28]

Throughout 1894 the situation in Uganda deteriorated as French Catholics increased their pressure and British protestants continually demanded that the English government do something to bring about a final solution to the problem. In 1893 Sir Gerald Portal had tried, with notable success, to bring religious stability to Uganda by forcing a conference with Roman Catholic and protestant leaders in April of that year. According to the British officer, the meeting was a stormy one in which in the long run it was decided to allow Portal to try to settle the outstanding political and religious differences. Portal simply decided to segregate the two feuding factions and to restrict missionary activities to a certain area.[29] In a letter Portal wrote,

All's well that ends well, but I don't wish ever again to have three and a half hour skermish with two angry bishops—one not understanding English,

27 Speech delivered on June 7, 1894, by Etienne as recorded in Eugène Etienne, *Son oeuvre—Coloniale Algérienne et politique 1881–1906*, I (Paris: Flammarion, 1907), 239–40.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 240.

29 Letter from Sir Gerald Portal to his Mother, Kampala, April 7, 1893, as found in Portal, *Mission to Uganda*, pp. 222–27.

and the other knowing no French. The whole history of Uganda for the last ten years is more worthy of the Middle Ages, or the days of the Edict of Nantes, than the end of the nineteenth century; but I don't think either side is more to blame than the other.[30]

Portal was fortunate in having the Protestant Bishop Tucker aid him in the final draft of the agreement,[31] and despite some general translational confusion, the protestant and Catholic officials slowly came to view it as an acceptable, if not palatable solution to a very bloody problem.[32]

Not overlooked in the process of Portal's mission was the fact that the British officer was slowly replacing East African Company authority with direct English imperial rule. The British missionaries approved of the transfer of authority to colonial officials as they had approved of Portal's actions in dealing with the Catholic missionaries.[33] The English-speaking ecclesiastics had every reason to be pleased, since they were certain that Portal's actions in replacing company authority would become a permanent imperial situation, and that Uganda would eventually be made a full-fledged member of the British empire.

The British missionaries did not have to wait any length of time for action in Uganda. Already Rosebery planned to relieve the East African Company of its financially burdensome responsibilities in the region and replace it with a British protectorate, not that that particular action would alter the situation in east Africa. Rosebery believed also that the Uganda situation was tied to the Egypto-Nile question. The Prime Minister believed that it was vital to hold the east African territory to protect the English presence in Egypt. For these reasons Rosebery wanted a stronger, more direct rule, over the territory. The British for all practical purposes ruled there already. Lugard had represented British imperial power and had sided, as he was ordered, with the *wa-Inglesa* and English missionaries, despite his overt disgust with Pilkington and his ecclesiastical colleagues. Lugard had even planned, at one point, to return to England to lobby for official British action in Uganda. He realized that the East Africa

30 *Ibid.*, p. 226.

31 Lugard, *Rise of East African Empire*, II, 557–59.

32 Diary entries for April 8, 11, 13, 22, 23, 24, and 25, 1893, as found in Portal, *Mission to Uganda*, pp. 227–29.

33 Harford-Battersby, *Pilkington*, pp. 209–10.

Company planned to evacuate the area for financial reasons,[34] and he hoped that the government would take concrete steps to annex the region.

Rosebery, in 1894, was moving toward establishing a protectorate in Uganda.[35] Many British colonial officials in east Africa agreed with the activist Prime Minister's action in expelling some Catholic missionaries.[36] The English in the east African area prepared for the declaration of the protectorate, which came in June, 1894, and there was little change in Uganda after that date since imperial administration had been in effect for some time. Charges placed on Catholics for the importation of goods, imposed by the East Africa Company, for example, remained in full force despite official protest from the Paris government. To reinforce the colonial English rule, officials in east Africa expelled some Catholic missionaries as subversives.[37] In 1895, when the conservative Lord Salisbury replaced Rosebery as Prime Minister, British policy in east Africa continued. In the final analysis, the British missionaries and their Church Missionary Society supporters in Great Britain and in Uganda were successful in their attempts to bring the area into the empire.

As has been seen, the declaration of the Uganda protectorate in 1894 and the declaration of the East Africa protectorate a year later did not change much so far as British administration in the area was concerned. However, nowhere was the full force of the missionary pressure seen so clearly as in Uganda. How much time the missionaries devoted to British imperial politics and how much effort was expended to the cause of religious conversion was hard to tell. The ecclesiastics themselves wrote about great numbers of conversions, and, on the other hand, explorer-administrators like Frederick D.

34 Perham's introduction to Perham, *Lugard Diaries*, III, 11–18.

35 An important secondary work on this area is Roland Oliver and Gervaise Mathew, *A History of East Africa*, I (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), 420–432. The authors presented a clear, chronological discussion of the Uganda annexation. Of special interest is also Robinson and Gallagher's *Africa and Victorians*, chapter XI.

36 Hardinge, *Diplomatist*, p. 123.

37 Ministerial Note by Gabriel Hanotaux, Paris, February 6, 1895, as found in France, MaE, volume Aden 1885–1895. The French Foreign Minister instructed his consul in Aden to prepare for the passage of Catholic missionaries from all of east Africa to France. Catholic missionaries were expelled from Zanzibar, East Africa, and Uganda.

Lugard recorded numerous incidences of clerical meddling in colonial, political matters.

The British Victorian missionaries did engage heavily in expansionistic politics which retarded inter-denominational cooperation and often encouraged all out violent conflict. The French missionaries did the same thing with the same bloody results in other areas of Africa. But were those individuals untrue to the faith which they professed? In the Victorian sense of the ideal they were not, since men like George Pilkington of Uganda saw colonial politics and imperial expansion as intertwined. What was good for Great Britain's imperial expansion was good also for the English religious effort. The religious chauvinism and national prejudice were part of the society in which the missionaries were raised and the society in which they existed. The British and French missionaries were human and were unable to separate themselves from the world, the only world with which they were familiar. The English-speaking missionaries played a strong role in the acquistion of Uganda, and in fact in all of the British East Africa. In this respect they were vitally important, but often times simply irritating to the colonial and company officials in the area. The pressure placed on Rosebery to act in a direct manner in respect to Uganda fell on receptive ears since he was already committed to that course of action, and a brief unofficial political alliance was formed between the activist Prime Minister and the missionaries in Uganda and in Great Britain. The missionaries left behind language, religion, and bits of British culture. In this respect they were also important. But they were men, existing in an historical and cultural time period and to see them as more is unjust, as less is not to comprehend at all the Victorian religious and colonial mind.

Popular Revolt in the Ninth Century

by Allen Cabaniss

The last note in the annals of Xanten for the year 841 is about "a powerful combination of servile folk" in Saxony who arose against their masters. "Adopting the designation *Stellings*, they committed numerous irrational acts," in the course of which "the nobles of that country suffered severe and atrocious maltreatment at the hands of those slavish people."[1]

The background of that occurrence was a civil war in the Frankish state. Emperor Louis the Pious died in the summer of 840, leaving the government in theory to his three sons.[2] What followed was a struggle for power among them and their partisans. Rather quickly Louis the German formed an alliance with Charles the Bald to strike at the paramount position of their brother, Emperor Lothair I. At Fontenoy on 25 June 841 the two sides engaged in a fierce battle, marked by frightful and shocking carnage, resulting in temporary defeat for Lothair, but not in a stable peace.[3]

The observant chronicler then recounted, between the battle and the Stelling insurrection, a prodigy in the sky on Thursday, 28 July. In broad daylight three arcs, semicircular like a rainbow, appeared. The smallest, but most colorful one, lay around the sun; the next, the largest, lay toward the west, but one of its prongs seemed to touch

1 Annales Xantenses, 841. *Annales regni Francorum* (Ann. r. Fr.) and Nithard, *Historiarum libri quattuor* (Nith.), are printed in Reinhold Rau, ed., *Fontes ad historiam regni Francorum aevi Karolini illustrandam*, I (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1956); *Annales Bertiniani* (Ann. Bert.) and *Annales Xantenses* (Ann. Xant.), in *ibid.*, II (1958); *Annales Fuldenses* (Ann. Fuld.) and Regino, *Chronica* (Regino), in *ibid.*, III (1960); *Annalium Fuldensium pars prima* (Ann. Fuld., I), in *Annales Fuldenses*, ed. G. H. Pertz and F. Kurze (Hanover: Hahn, 1891), in the series *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Each will be cited hereafter by a brief title given above in parentheses, followed by the year. All translations in the text are my own.

2 Allen Cabaniss, *Son of Charlemagne* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1961; 2nd printing, 1965). 122–125

3 See the vivid description in *Versus de bella quae fuit acta Fontaneto* (*Poetae Latini aevi Carolini*, II, 138f.).

the sun; the medium-sized one lay toward the north, but touched the other two with its prongs. The two latter arcs were not as bright as the smallest one. During the same period a small cloud, similar in shape to the half-circles, was visible a distance away in the northeast. All these phenomena were witnessed continuously from shortly before nine o'clock in the morning until some time in the afternoon.[4]

Emperor Lothair correctly perceived that a division existed in Saxon sentiment. Some of the nobility had favored him; some, his brother Louis. After the battle of Fontenoy he determined to gain further Saxon support, not from the nobles (*edhilingui*), but rather from the lower classes (*frilingi=ingenuiles; lazzi=serviles*) who constituted a majority of the population. In order to do so, he sent envoys among them promising, in return for their aid, that they could revert to the customs of their pagan ancestors. Thus the notable historian, Nithard, illegitimate half-uncle of the warring brothers, wrote.[5] He is confirmed less elaborately by the annalist of St. Bertin for 841 who stated: "Lothair . . . sought to gain for his side especially those Saxons called Stellings, the most populous element of that nation, by giving them an option of choosing whatever law by which they preferred to abide."[6]

The proposal appealed to the humbler Saxons and the movement spread among them like wild fire. Perhaps it was greed, as the aristocratic Nithard supposed; perhaps it was a smouldering resentment against the Christianity imposed on them so mercilessly by Charlemagne; perhaps it was the simplicity of revolt for its own sake. In any case, they quickly constituted themselves a coherent dissident group, even adopting for their organization a novel name, *Stellinga*. Soon they were roving about the countryside committing acts of terrorism. The lords, taken by surprise, began to flee from Saxony in large numbers. The Stellings, excited by success, proceeded to fall into anarchy, "each man living by whatever law he pleased."[7]

The movement began presumably in the autumn of 841 and continued into the early months of 842. It was aided by Northmen whom Lothair had invited and to whom he gave permission to ravage the lands of his brother Louis. The latter became fearful that these two

[4] Ann. Xant., 841.
[5] Nith., IV, 2.
[6] Ann. Bert., 841.
[7] Nith., IV, 2.

parties would be joined in a formal invasion of his kingdom by Slavs (who were in some way related to the Stellings).[8] But for the moment it seemed far more immediate for him and Charles to resume direct hostilities with Lothair.

On 14 February 842 Louis and Charles, along with their troops, met in Strasbourg, where they took the famed oaths of alliance, recorded by Nithard, which have such philological importance, Louis swearing in Romanic and Charles in Germanic so that the other's adherents might understand. The partisans of each then vowed in their own languages to insure the covenant.[9] After the formalities, they launched attacks on the lands of their imperial brother. So hard was the combined pressure on Lothair that by summer's end he was in full retreat.[10]

In the meanwhile, however, the war was causing so much disruption that many magnates became disillusioned. Enough of them on both sides were in agreement that they were able in early autumn (1 October) to intervene and demand an armistice.[11] It was indeed only an armistice, but the brothers welcomed a breathing spell in which to return to their own lands for a time, Lothair to his capital at Aix-la-Chapelle, Charles to Aquitaine, and Louis to Saxony.[12]

Each ruler had affairs to set in order, but none so urgently as Louis. As soon as he got back to Saxony, he began vigorously rounding up members of the Stellinga. In order to curb the insurrectionists, he caused the death penalty to be liberally inflicted.[13] The annalist of St. Bertin noted that a hundred and forty were beheaded, fourteen hanged, many maimed by amputation of limbs, none being left able to resist any further.[14] By its numerical indication, the statement does not suggest that the ruthless treatment was directed only against leadership of the movement, but also against rank-and-file Stellings. It is, therefore, possible to suppose that the uprising really was a popular one without much guidance.

The matter was not over, although Louis may have thought so, for he then withdrew to his seat of government in Bavaria to spend the

8 *Ibid.*
9 *Ibid.*, III, 5.
10 Ann. Bert., 842.
11 Ann. Xant., 842.
12 Nith., IV, 4.
13 *Ibid.*
14 Ann. Bert., 842.

winter. The Saxon Stellings, outraged by the brutal royal vengeance, took advantage of his absence, reorganized, and once more rose in revolt against their masters. The nobles must have been aware of their plans, for this time they, too, were organized to resist. In a pitched battle the Stellings were crushed and slaughtered. "And so," remarked the smug annalist, "the lawless and arrogant insurgents perished at the hands of constituted authority."[15]

From the records we are entitled to make certain generalizations about the foregoing incident. First, it was obviously a genuine revolt of the "masses" against their masters. Secondly, it was fed by the insane destructiveness of civil strife. Third, it was encouraged by superstition. Fourth, it was, for all practical purposes, leaderless. Fifth, it was quite localized. Sixth, it was supported by part of the "establishment." Seventh, it was aided and abetted by "outsiders." Eighth, it had a certain inherent resilience. But, ninth, it was crushed by superior force.

Several questions now arise. How frequent were such occurrences in the ninth century? How serious were they? What expression did they take? What were the probable causes? What were the fuels that fed the flames? It would be futile to expect much by way of answer from chroniclers of the time. They were not very interested in such questions. Only now and then did something happen that they deemed worthy of their record. Yet they do reveal enough to suggest undercurrents that are intriguing to modern readers.

* * *

The times were exceedingly troubled. Perhaps too much has been made of the description of the year 852 in the annals of Xanten: "The iron of the heathen flashed. The sun's heat was excessive. Famine ensued. Fodder for cattle failed. Only provender for hogs was plentiful."[16] Yet the account is not so far-fetched and it certainly does not stand alone. Only two years earlier the annals of Fulda record such a severe famine that in one village alone Bishop Hrabanus Maurus fed more than three hundred of the inhabitants daily. One poor woman, with a sucking child at her breast, collapsed and died as she approached the bread line. In another district a father and mother considered killing their little boy and eating him. They were saved

15 Nith., IV, 6.
16 Ann. Xant., 852.

from that atrocity as they saw a stag brought down by two wolves. Driving the wolves away, they greedily devoured the carcass.[17]

Still earlier the annals of Xanten gave almost as gloomy a picture for 838, although not in such compressed language as for 852:

> Winter was rainy with severe winds. On 21 January thunder was heard. On 16 February even louder thunder was heard and the sun's heat scorched the earth. In certain areas an earthquake occurred and fire in the shape of a dragon was visible in the air. Heretical pravity made its appearance in that year. On 21 December the crash of mighty thunder was heard and flashes of lightning seen. And in many ways the distress and misfortune of men was daily increasing.[18]

In 853 famine in Saxony drove many to eat their horses.[19] In 857 a plague of boils spread among the masses, causing such foul-smelling decay of flesh that fingers and toes, hands and feet, fell away from still living men and women.[20] In 860 a snow of blood was reported in a number of places.[21] Less than a decade and a half later pestilential locusts in great swarms came from the east and devastated "all Gaul." Unusually large, with six wings, they flew and alighted with military precision. Finally blown into the Atlantic, for many days thereafter their bodies were thrown up on the shores in mountainous piles. Many persons died from the fetid stench of rotting locusts.[22]

There were other disasters, man-made, that caused havoc. Muslim pirates from the south struck as much terror as the pagan Northmen did.[23] From the east there was at least a threat of Slavic uprisings.[24] Internal strife was almost endemic: kinsmen against kinsmen, ruler against subjects, churchmen against kings. There were rapid changes, constantly shifting loyalties, patent deterioration of government, and, above all, displacement of peoples. Early in the century Charlemagne had compelled thousands of Saxons to leave their homes and seek residence elsewhere in the Frankish state. In mid-century and earlier many Mozarabs fled northward over the Pyrenees from their Spanish

17 Ann. Fuld., 850.
18 Ann. Xant., 838.
19 *Ibid.*, 853.
20 *Ibid.*, 857.
21 Ann. Fuld., 860.
22 Regino, 873.
23 Ann. Xant., 846, 850.
24 Ann. Fuld., 855.

native land to escape or avoid sporadic outbursts of Muslim repression. Vast multitudes of people were thus homeless wanderers, without root or stability, without means of support, prey to almost any kind of suggestion that might alter, even if not improve, their conditions.

* * *

Strange visionaries made their presence felt. In 867 two priests in the diocese of Mainz boasted that they could converse with angels and perform miracles. Crowds of both rich and poor alike flocked to their forest lairs bringing gifts, although they were ultimately degraded. In the nearby diocese of Cologne popular frenzy and resentment refused to accept the deposition of Bishop Gunthar. When he returned from trial in Rome, he was received with jubilation, clanging of bells, and processions with Gospel book and incense.[25] In 839 an English priest saw a vision announcing various ills destined to befall mankind because of evil deeds. Among them were preternatural darkness, the Viking long ships, and famine.[26] In 847 a false prophetess, Thiota, came to Mainz proclaiming the imminent end of the world. Many, led astray by her babblings, offered gifts to her in return for her prayers, as though she were divinely inspired. Under interrogation she confessed that she had been prompted by a certain priest.[27] In 874 a dream was reported which depicted Emperor Louis *the Pious* suffering the torments of purgatory.[28]

In a village not far from Bingen an evil spirit (in human form?) began a series of disturbances, throwing stones at people and beating on the walls of their houses. It then found occasion to speak out in public betraying what people did furtively, sowing discord among the villagers. Gradually the malice of the poltergeist was restricted to one particular man and his family. The persecution became so strong that he, his wife, and children were driven out of their house. No one would give them shelter for fear of the malign force. The family was therefore compelled to live out in the fields, but the spirit set fire to the fields.

Soon the villagers accused the poor, harried man of crimes demanding vengeance, but he promptly and courageously vindicated

25 Ann. Xant., 867.
26 Ann. Bert., 839.
27 Ann. Fuld., 847.
28 *Ibid.*, 874.

himself by the ordeal of hot iron. Clergymen were then summoned from Mainz to exorcise the poltergeist. As they began the litany and aspersion of holy water, the "devil" at first retaliated strenuously by a hail of stones, but gradually subsided. Thinking the exorcism successful, the clerics returned to Mainz.

Suddenly the spirit reappeared and declared that a priest (whom he named) had stood by him as the holy water was sprinkled. The frightened villagers crossed themselves in fear, while the demon said of the priest, "He is my slave. Whoever is under his influence is his slave. Only recently, at my persuasion, here in this village he violated the bailiff's daughter." With that revelation, the evil spirit renewed his acts of terror, which continued for three years until almost every dwelling in the village was burned down.[29]

* * *

There should be no wonder that the illiterate masses—starving, frightened, homeless, diseased—struck out in any way they could to give vent to their discontent, blindly or misguidedly or shrewdly, as the Stellings did in 841. Their actions took many expressions. One of the commonest and easiest was thievery. On 1 September 853 robbers entered the basilica of St. Boniface the martyr at Fulda and made away with part of the church treasure. The crime was never investigated, the culprits never found, and the money never recovered.[30] Occasionally lynching mobs were formed to attack anyone who seemed "different."[31] As early as 781 an annalist recorded that "many portents were apparent: among them the sign of the cross was very frequently seen on men's clothes,"[32] a statement suggesting an organized band (outlaws, vigilantes, penitentes?), but otherwise unexplained, except that it was something mysterious.

In 823 at the hamlet of Commercy a young twelve-year-old girl began a hunger strike, announcing that she would continue abstaining from food for ten months. The annalist duly recorded this as a "prodigy."[33] She was mentioned no further until November 825 when more details were given.[34] Apparently her name was known,

29 The three paragraphs preceding this note are derived from *ibid.*, 858.
30 *Ibid.*, 853.
31 Allen Cabaniss, *Agobard of Lyons: Churchman and Critic* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1953), 24, 29f.
32 Ann. Fuld., I, 781.
33 Ann. r. Fr., 823.
34 *Ibid.*, 825.

but it has been lost in the course of manuscript transmission. The writer then stated that she had begun to fast immediately after her Easter communion of 823. At first it was from bread, then from other foods and drink, until no food entered her mouth and she lost all desire to eat.

About All Saints' Day of 825, two and a half years later, she began to take nourishment and to eat "like other mortals." What are we to make of this story? Obviously it was a prearranged fast, or the annalist would not have known at its inception that it was supposed to last ten months or would not have recorded it as a prodigy. But thirty, not ten, months later, during which there was no reference to her in the annals, we learn that it was a fast gradually undertaken, that it lasted three times the intended period, that it was associated with two major ecclesiastical festivals.

One more note may be added. For the year 858, the annalist records that a monk (Usuard, as we know from other sources) of the Parisian monastery of St. Vincent the martyr and St. Germanus the confessor made a trip to Muslim Córdoba. When he returned he brought with him the relics of certain blessed martyrs, George (a deacon), Aurelius, and Nathalia (Sabigotho), which he deposited for safe-keeping (and veneration?) at Aimant.[35]

The three deceased persons named had been martyred by Islamic authorities only six years earlier (852). Aurelius, of a Muslim father and Christian mother, was a secret Christian, as was his wife Sabigotho (Nathalia), born of Muslim parents. Deacon George was a monk from Palestine.[36] All were victims of persecution that was provoked by their vocal dissidence and all were distrusted even by segments of the Spanish church. It would appear, therefore, that translation of their relics to France might be a form of dissidence in the Frankish church.

* * *

The preceding data are, of course, open to varying possibilities, but it seems to me that they all suggest popular revolt, evoked by miserable conditions, fanned by visionaries and portents, resulting in aimless floundering and meaningless lashing out at the "establishment" by any means at hand.

35 Ann. Bert., 858.

36 Edward P. Colbert, *The Martyrs of Cordoba (850–859): A Study of the Sources* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1962), 235–241.